

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 14896) granting a pension to Erastus A. Buck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 14897) granting a pension to Nathan L. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14898) granting an increase of pension to Fronie Fisher; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of North Dakota on January 11, 1919, urging the adoption of the Susan B. Anthony national suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial of H. W. R. Strong, chairman of flood control and member of law and legislative bureau, Whittier Chamber of Commerce, relative to impounding the waters of Colorado River for irrigation purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, memorial adopted by California Chapter of American Mining Congress in San Francisco, urging enactment of Senate bill 5234 and House bill 13497; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of National War-Service Committee of Retail Dry Goods and Department Stores, protesting against luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America, demanding eight-hour day, increase in salary, reinstatement of men and women discharged for union affiliation, and thorough investigation of wire system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolutions of District Council No. 24, Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America, demanding eight-hour day, increase in salary commensurate with increased cost of living, and reinstatement of several hundred men and women discharged for union affiliation; also thorough investigation of wire system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of furriers of Philadelphia, Pa., for relief from the tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of Ohio State Board of Agriculture, favoring increase of compensation for employees in Bureau of Animal Industry and an increased appropriation for the work of the bureau; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Ohio State Postmasters' Association, in favor of parcel-post motor routes, as asked for by the department in appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of J. H. McGraw & Sons, Bellaire, Ohio, favoring continuance of Government control of the wire systems until further investigation can be made and additional legislation can be had for resuming private ownership; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Ervin Apell, Louis Helbrac, Jacob Leva, and George Leva, of East Liverpool, Ohio, asking for repeal of postal-zone rate bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NEELY: Petition of H. H. Sonneborn, president of West Virginia Clothiers' Association, protesting against luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution by the traffic and transportation bureau of the Tacoma (Wash.) Commercial Club and Chamber of Commerce, indorsing Senate bill 5020, and petitioning Congress to restore to the Interstate Commerce Commission certain powers taken away by the Federal control act approved March 21, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution by superintendent of public instruction, Sacramento, Cal., indorsing Senate bill 4987, providing for a Department of Education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, resolution by the California Chapter of the American Mining Congress, urging the passage of Senate bill 5234 and House bill 13497; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, resolution by the San Francisco Labor Council, requesting the Department of Agriculture to investigate the conditions existing in the Alaska fish-canning industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions by board of directors of the California Citrus League, urging that common carriers be released from Government control; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Memorial adopted by citizens of Pueblo, Colo., for the recognition of Ireland at the peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Board of Trade of Lansdale, Pa., favoring the control and operation of the telegraph and telephone systems by the Government until Congress shall have studied the question and determined upon a proper and safe procedure to be thereafter followed; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 23, 1919.

(Legislative day of Monday, January 20, 1919.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Nelson	Smoot
Bankhead	Johnson, Cal.	New	Spencer
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Sterling
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Swanson
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Thomas
Culberson	Kellogg	Penrose	Townsend
Cummins	King	Pittman	Trammell
Curtis	Kirby	Pollock	Underwood
Fletcher	Knox	Pollock	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Sheppard	Walsh
Gay	McCumber	Sherman	Watson
Gerry	McKellar	Simmmons	Weeks
Gronna	McNary	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Hale	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Henderson	Moses	Smith, Mich.	

Mr. GAY. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL].

Mr. KIRBY. I announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], who is detained on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I announce the absence of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] on account of illness.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING], who is detained in committee.

Mr. KING. I wish to announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN] are detained on official business.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] is detained on official business and that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] are detained by illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

LABOR CONDITIONS IN SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. HITCHCOCK obtained the floor.

Mr. JONES of Washington. May I ask the Senator from Nebraska to yield to me for just a moment? I have to attend a meeting of the Committee on Commerce, and I wish to put in the RECORD a couple of telegrams. They are in reference to a statement made by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] the other day in the discussion.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. JONES of Washington. A day or two ago, in the discussion of the pending bill, the Senator from California made a statement based upon a press report in reference to conditions in Seattle. This press report stated that there were soldiers and sailors who were being fed and cared for by the I. W. W., and that they engaged in a riot and demonstration, and so forth. I sent a telegram to the mayor of Seattle under date of January 22, reading as follows:

JANUARY 22, 1919.

OLE HANSON,
Mayor Seattle, Wash.:

Senator JOHNSON stated on floor of Senate yesterday that press dispatch said that after dispersing demonstration of I. W. W.'s at Seattle "it was found that among the outcast I. W. W.'s were soldiers and sailors of the United States, who were being fed by the I. W. W. and who were without resources of money or food." Is this correct? Kindly advise facts immediately.

W. L. JONES.

I have here a telegram from the mayor of Seattle, stating very definitely that this was not correct, that nothing of this

kind occurred. I also have a statement from Hon. Harold Preston, chairman of the King County Council of Defense, to the same effect. Without taking the time of the Senate, unless the Senator from California would like to hear them read, I will ask that the telegrams be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not care that they shall be read at length. I wish to say in explanation that I recited with absolute accuracy dispatches from Seattle which were published in our daily press here, and referred only to what was thus published and what was thus presented by reputable news agencies in the dispatches to newspapers here.

Mr. JONES of Washington. There is not any question about that. The Senator from California based his statement entirely upon newspaper reports. If the Senator from Nebraska will permit me, I ask that the Secretary may read the two telegrams.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will be very glad to hear them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., January 22, 1919.

Senator WESLEY L. JONES,
Washington, D. C.:

Sunday, January 12, meeting advertised on handbills signed Labor Council and Metal Trades Council. Metal Trades Council and Central Labor Council were unaware of meeting and not responsible therefor. Meeting ran peaceably nearly two hours. No disturbance at close of meeting; radicals formed parade behind lumber wagon bearing red flag. Red flag is used here as danger signal on lumber wagon in daytime, same as red lantern is used at night. Against city ordinance to have parade without permit. Officers tried to disperse parade; one of marchers struck captain of police, breaking his nose and blacking both eyes; officers arrested this man, who is an I. W. W., and also arrested 12 others. No soldiers or sailors have been arrested here at any time charged with being against law and order. So far as I know, they are with the authorities for the enforcement of law to a man. All employers, city and county government, have opened places for them on their return; there are no soldier and sailor outcasts being fed by the I. W. W. Different organizations here are taking care of returned soldiers and sailors, but strike now on will make it very hard to find employment for anyone if strike continues for any length of time. Seattle is and has been a peaceable city; there has been no disorder except the fracas of January 12; the strikers are peaceable citizens and are making no trouble. I was elected mayor on the platform of enforcing the law. The people of Seattle will not allow the preaching of the overthrow of the government by force and violence in this city; our statutes make such advocacy felony; not 1 per cent of our people favor any such doctrine. Seattle is a loyal city and will stand by the soldiers and sailors who went to the front. State of Washington and all the cities in the State are beginning great public works to employ labor; we hope Secretary Lane's land plan will carry. Now is the time for the Nation to expend large sums of money on development of land, thus employing labor and providing homes. One hundred million dollars for such a purpose is a joke. Not less than \$2,000,000,000 should be considered; there has been as yet no unemployment in this city. Up to the day of the strike labor was in good demand. The city is prosperous and conditions are good. I expect the strike to be settled within a few days, although I have no definite information. Soldiers and sailors should be given a bonus to help care for themselves during readjustment.

OLE HANSON, Mayor.

SEATTLE, WASH., January 22, 1919.

Senator WESLEY L. JONES,
Washington, D. C.:

Statement in Senate reported in your wire to Mayor Hanson is untrue. Owing to the deplorable neglect of the Government to make proper financial provisions for discharged soldiers and sailors, many of them have come to Seattle in need. County council of defense organize soldiers' and sailors' placement bureau, working in connection with Government employment office. The combination has so far succeeded in placing in positions all or nearly all discharged soldiers and sailors who have applied. The bureau is assisted at the counter by employees of Young Men's Christian Association, Knights of Columbus, Jewish Relief, War Camp Community Service, and Elks, paid by their respective employers, who assist and advise and also furnish free beds and meals to needy. A Red Cross agent is also present, who furnishes cash to applicants when needed. The service rendered is efficient as a temporary expedient, and we claim it very creditable to the community. We have heard of no better elsewhere. The I. W. W. or Bolshevik element here is small though noisy. Their chief stock in trade at the present time is to foment dissatisfaction among discharged soldiers and sailors on account of Government neglect to make proper provisions for them. Council of defense unanimously recommend immediate action by Congress granting bonus to all discharged soldiers and sailors and at least sufficient to enable them to live in comfort during the time of non-employment will take in many cases.

HAROLD PRESTON,
Chairman King County Council of Defense.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I wish simply to suggest, while it may be that the news account that was carried to us as to a particular instance occurring in Seattle, Wash., may have been inaccurate, nothing could better demonstrate the exact point to which I was alluding than the telegrams which have just been read. Those telegrams show, beyond peradventure of doubt, the great problem of unemployment which is confronting us to-day and which is confronting the city of Seattle, from which these telegrams come. With this great problem of unemployment thus confronting us, I insist that corroborative evidence is added now by these telegrams to the argument which

I endeavored to make a few days ago—that our first duty is to the men who come from across the sea, our first obligation is to the boys of America who have made the fight for America, rather than to those who are now living in Europe.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I think that the Senator's statement is entirely correct. These telegrams do reinforce the point that he made. The real reason that they were presented was to refute the specific statement of the press to which they referred. They do, however, reinforce the argument which the Senator made.

SUPPLIES OF POTASH.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HENDERSON. A few days ago the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] referred to the situation in this country relative to potash. Since then I have received a letter from the vice chairman of the War Trade Board, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

WAR TRADE BOARD,
Washington, January 21, 1919.

HON. CHARLES B. HENDERSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HENDERSON: Answering your favor of the 18th instant, we beg to advise that shortly after the Associated Press published the dispatch from Paris announcing that potash would be shipped at once in large quantities from Alsace to this country we cabled the Hon. Vance C. McCormick, who is in Paris, asking for reliable and full information regarding the matter. We have been informed by him that the French Government explains that no potash can be shipped from Alsace for several months, due to the fact that such quantities thereof as can be extracted will be needed for agricultural purposes in France during the coming spring.

The report from Mr. McCormick has been confirmed by the French High Commission in Washington, and so it would seem entirely proper to assume that the United States must depend upon its domestic production for the requirements of the coming crop year. The above information has already been given publicity through the daily press, and in conference yesterday with representatives of the potash industry in this country, with whom the situation was discussed, we learned that a definite program will be adopted which will give the broadest publicity to the fact that the United States must rely upon its own domestic supply for its potash needs for the coming year.

Should you desire further information, please call upon us and we shall promptly respond. Assuring you it is a great pleasure to serve you in this or any other connection, believe us to be, my dear Senator HENDERSON,

Very truly, yours,

CLARENCE M. WOOLLEY,
Vice Chairman.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President, my reason for asking that the letter be read is to give the information to those interested in the potash situation. The farmer should know the true condition, and I take this means of making public the contents of the above letter.

FOOD SUPPLIES FOR EUROPE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13708) providing for the relief of such populations in Europe, and countries contiguous thereto, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President as necessary.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I had not expected to take the time of the Senate in discussing this bill appropriating \$100,000,000 to purchase food for people in Europe. Had it not been for the course taken by the discussion, I should not have done so.

Senators are entitled to their opinions as to the wisdom of backing the President and the nations with whom we are associated, not only in the war but in the settlement of the war. They are entitled to their opinions upon the wisdom of backing up the President, who is now in Europe negotiating for peace and making every effort to bring those peace negotiations to an early conclusion. There may be a difference of opinion as to the wisdom or justification for voting these large sums of money for food. To my mind, it is justified; to my mind, when Europe is suffering from the aftermath of the war, when a large area of country is still in turmoil, and is almost without an established government, it is a wise thing for the United States, France, Great Britain, and Italy to do as they have done in the supreme war council—direct the expenditure of \$300,000,000 for the purpose of bringing immediate relief to people suffering from starvation and struggling in the work of reinstating governments.

I say it is not only a matter of charity, but it is a matter of good business policy and war expediency to remove from these people, if possible, the evils of starvation and to put them in

a frame of mind where they will listen to reason and will support order and government rather than revert to anarchy and disorder. We can not have any peace if Europe is to remain in a perfect welter of disorder and social disturbance and governmental overthrow. The reestablishment of order is the first thing to be considered, and we who eat our three meals a day know very well that starving people can not view things as can people who are not confronted with that danger.

So I say I am willing to take the judgment of the President of the United States, of Mr. Hoover, and of other representatives we have over there, who have already concluded in the supreme war council an agreement by which all these countries are to help bring this relief. Our share is \$100,000,000. Are we to hesitate? Are we to discredit our own representatives over there?

Mr. President, I have not been slow in the past from my place in the Senate here to oppose the President when it has seemed to me he was infringing upon the powers and responsibilities of the legislative body. Everyone knows that. You know I have brought myself into discredit at the White House because I have done so, and I do not hesitate even now to exercise my right as a United States Senator to criticize a department when good can come from it. But what possible good, what possible relief, can come from such criticisms and attacks as we have listened to in the Senate during the last few days?

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KNOX. I am only after information in order that I may form a proper judgment on this measure. I am entirely open-minded about it. The Senator from Nebraska refers to the request for this hundred million dollars as being because of the action of the war council. Will he indicate where the information upon that subject may be found?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], who is in charge of the bill and who is suffering from a bad throat, has turned over to me certain matters, some of which, I think, has already been read; but the information contained in cablegrams to the Secretary of State from our mission in Paris is to the effect—I will not read it unless the Senator desires me to do so—

Mr. KNOX. I only want the Senator from Nebraska to indicate, so far as I am concerned, where I could obtain the information.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The cablegram states that the supreme council of supply reported to the supreme war council a proposition for the expenditure of \$300,000,000 in food supplies for the starving people of Europe.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, will the Senator be good enough to indicate where that cablegram may be found?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will read a part of it to the Senator. I do not know that it has been printed. It is dated "Paris, January 14," and addressed to the Secretary of State at Washington:

The following resolutions adopted Sunday, January 12, at meeting of supreme council of supply and relief were presented yesterday at the meeting of the presiding war council and were formally adopted by the representatives of the allied Governments and the United States.

1. That it is imperative in the interest of humanity and for the maintenance of orderly government that relief should be given to certain European countries. It is provisionally estimated that for the furnishing of this relief till next harvest a minimum sum of \$300,000,000 may be necessary apart from the requirements of Germany, which will be separately examined.

2. The council is of opinion that this sum of \$300,000,000 should be placed at its disposal by the four associated governments.

3. That the financial representatives of the four governments should consider and make recommendations to meet this expenditure.

4. If these recommendations be accepted by the council, they should then be referred to the respective governments for their approval.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, what strikes me, if the Senator will indulge me for just a second, is that I have before me the hearings and what purport to be the cablegrams that have been received from abroad in relation to the subject, and I do not find that cablegram.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is one of the cablegrams that have been received, nevertheless.

Mr. KNOX. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is the fault I find with the hearings—they have not been sympathetic; they have been antagonistic. There seems to have been more desire to develop causes for criticism and scandal than to develop the reasons for this bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, before the Senator gets fairly started in his speech, I wish to call his attention to the fact, which seems to have been generally overlooked, that this is not alone a proposal to feed people in Europe; it is to furnish them foodstuffs and other urgent supplies. I assume that the Senator

has that in mind, and that this money, when appropriated, can be expended for anything which in the judgment of the commissioners those people need.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I hope it can. I am willing to trust the judgment of the American commissioners; and we have got to trust their judgment if we are going to do anything.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Part of it may be used especially for agricultural implements.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It may be used for agricultural implements; I do not know. Mr. President, we are represented in Europe, and our representatives are in concert with the other great powers that have been engaged in this war. They have agreed upon a program, and the question is whether we are going to repudiate our own representatives and set up our own judgment when we know nothing about the matter.

So I say, Mr. President, that I am ready, much as I dislike to do so, to vote the \$100,000,000 out of the Treasury. I disliked to declare war; I disliked very much to vote thousands of millions of dollars for war supplies; I disliked very much to be compelled to draft American boys and send them into the war; I disliked to do all those things; but they were necessary for the good of the country, and this is necessary if we are to bring about an early conclusion of peace.

Senators on the other side criticize the President because he does not make haste. How much time has been wasted here in irrelevant attacks on this bill? The administration has been attacked for everything under the sun under the guise of opposition to this bill.

But what I particularly desire to say to-day, Mr. President, relates to what was developed yesterday in the nature of an attack on Mr. Hoover and the Food Administration. I am not going to dodge the issue in any respect. The plain inference, if not the practical charge, made here is that Mr. Hoover's errand in Europe is not what it purports to be, to support the President in aiding him to bring about peace as soon as possible, of which the distribution of this relief is a part, but that his real errand in Europe and his purpose in recommending this bill is to use the Treasury of the United States for the purpose of adding to the profits of the packers. That is the charge.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for just a moment?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Has the Senator any further information that the Senate does not possess relative to the reasons for asking for this appropriation? The Senator has presented something here that I have not heard about before. He referred a moment ago to certain papers that have been handed to him by the chairman of the committee. I am wondering if there is any other authentic information which the Senate ought to have on this subject?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think that that is a fair question. I do not know whether or not the cablegram I hold in my hand from the American mission has been read, but it states in some detail, as much as a cablegram can, the conditions in various countries near to and adjoining Germany, the dire need for food; and perhaps if it has not been read I should read it. This cablegram is from the American mission in Paris; it bears no date, but it was received within a day or two, and gives these details:

On area covered by new appropriation general situation of these countries is that their animals are largely reduced, their crops were far below normal, due to man and animal shortage, ravage, and climatic conditions. The surplus harvest above absolute needs is now rapidly approaching exhaustion, and consequently the towns and cities are in dangerous situation. Our reports show specifically, Finland, that food is practically exhausted in cities; that while many of the peasants have some bread, other sections are mixing large amount of straw. They are exhausted of fats, meats, sugar, and need help to prevent a renewed rise of Bolshevism.

Baltic States' food may last one or two months on much reduced scale. They sent deputation our minister, Stockholm, imploring food.

Serbia town bread ration down 3 ounces daily in north. Not accessible from Salonika. In south, where accessible, British are furnishing food to civil population. We are trying to get food in from Adriatic.

Jugo-Slavia bread ration in many towns 3 or 4 ounces in all classes. Short of fats, milk, and meat.

Vienna, except for supplies furnished by Italians and Swiss, their present bread ration of 6 ounces per diem would disappear. Large illness from shortage fats, ration being 1½ ounces per week. No coffee, sugar, eggs, practically no meat.

Tyrol is being fed by Swiss charity.

Poland peasants probably have enough to get through. Mortality in cities, particularly among children, appalling for lack of fats and milk, meat, bread. Situation in bread will be worse in two months.

Roumania, bread supply entire people estimated to last another 30 days. Short of fats and milk. Last harvest 60 per cent a failure.

Bulgaria, harvest also a failure. Supplies available probably two or three months.

Armenia already starving.

Czecho-Slovaks, large suffering lack of fats and milk. Have bread for two, three months. Have sugar six months.

We have each country under investigation as to total amounts required to barely sustain life, and their resources to pay. Preliminary investi-

gation by Taylor and staff in connection with allied staffs show total above areas will require about 1,400,000 tons imported food to get through until next harvest, costing, say, \$350,000,000 delivered.

Mr. TOWNSEND. By whom is that signed?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is signed by the American mission.

Now, what does this show? It shows that our representatives, in connection with those of Great Britain, France, and Italy, have investigated the question and have reached a conclusion. It shows that the other nations have already entered upon that work which we are asked to join in entering upon; and shall we be laggards? Shall we sit here and, because we have criticisms to make of the administration, or political profit to get out of an antagonism, hold up this bill?

Mr. President, I want to refer now to what was brought up yesterday. It is charged that a small packer, Mr. Tallafiero, appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and testified that he believed Mr. Hoover was going to keep his word with the packers; and that is the charge against Mr. Hoover—that Hoover is going to keep the word he gave to the packers with regard to the price of their products.

Now, I have not any use for the packers' combine. I am glad to support any measure which will result in bringing them under Government control, and I know Mr. Hoover is. I am glad to vote for tax bills which will take out of them their unconscionable profits, if they have made any; but if the word of the United States, or of a recognized official of the United States, has been given to the packers and they have acted upon it, it is our business also to see that it is made good.

What did Congress do, Mr. President? Congress passed an act guaranteeing to the farmers of the United States a certain price on their wheat, not only for last year but for this year also; and wheat not yet planted is guaranteed a price of \$2.26 per bushel by the act of the Congress of the United States. Why?

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KELLOGG. The Senator is not exactly accurate in that statement. The act of Congress guaranteed the price for 1918 only at \$2 a bushel minimum, but it did authorize the President, if in his judgment production would be encouraged, and it was necessary, to publish a proclamation guaranteeing the price of wheat in any year, and the President did it for 1919.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; it was done under authority of Congress; and why was it done? Not because we wanted to enrich the farmers, because they needed nothing of the sort. It was done for the purpose of winning the war. That guaranty of the price of wheat was put in there as a stimulus to the production of wheat, and the production of wheat was necessary to win the war. That is why we did it.

Now, what did Mr. Hoover do? Hoover, under the powers that were intrusted to him by Congress and the President, was under an obligation. He was under an obligation to use those powers also for the purpose of stimulating all the energies necessary to win the war, and he did it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator think that when Mr. Hoover, or the men who were in his employ, utilized the powers which were conferred upon them to put independents out of business that was helping to win the war?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; and I deny that he did it.

Mr. BORAH. I say that he did.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I know something of the struggle Mr. Hoover has had with the packing combine in the United States, and I want to say, Mr. President, that if there had not been a Hoover and a Food Administration the packers would have made a great deal more money than they did make.

Mr. BORAH. I say that the evidence is sufficient to show that they did do it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I deny it.

Mr. BORAH. I say they did.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I deny it absolutely, and I say that Mr. Hoover is coming out of this thing vindicated. You have taken him at a time when he is in Europe carrying on his work. He has been vindicated and has won every fight that he has had while he was in the United States. He is a man who comes out of this war, I believe, with a better reputation than any other public official. He comes out clean. He comes out having rendered a great service to the American people. He comes out at the head of a great army of volunteer citizens—men, women, and children—who at his request have saved and skimped and helped him to conserve the food that was necessary to win the war; and I want to say to you that, in my opinion, Mr. Hoover stands in the hearts of the American people equal to any man in the United States. I am very sure that there is no Member of the Senate who, if he ran for President against Mr. Hoover, would be able to poll as many votes as he would poll.

Mr. President, I am aware of the very strong antagonism that certain Senators and others have developed for Mr. Hoover, but the fact remains that from the very day that the war broke out in Europe Hoover has been engaged in self-sacrificing service. He was in London when war broke out, and when the great horde of American travelers, many of them penniless and without credit, came flocking to the American Embassy, Hoover was one of the American citizens who had credit, who went and took the cash out of his bank and himself loaned over \$200,000 to the people who came to the American Embassy. He loaned it to hundreds of people, rich and poor, school-teachers and others on vacation trips. Anybody who came there in distress received his money; and then, having shown himself to be not only a public-spirited and patriotic American citizen, but a great organizer, he was put at the head of the great relief work in Belgium and acquitted himself to the plaudits of all the world; and he has followed that up by making a great record in the United States by self-sacrificing service in this war.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have not attacked Mr. Hoover.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It sounds to me very much like it.

Mr. BORAH. I said in the beginning that I was not attacking Mr. Hoover's individual integrity. I do not care to go into it. It is not a matter of concern to me. I simply said that the system which he organized was one which I could not approve; and, having organized it upon that basis, I would not vote to turn over a hundred million dollars to him. I said so for reasons given, certain facts stated, and I challenge the Senator to dispute those facts.

Now, I have no objection to the Senator's eulogy upon Mr. Hoover. I do not find fault with it at all. I ask him what he has to say as to the facts which I presented.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I want to talk about some of the facts that the Senator presented yesterday. That is just what I am coming to.

The changes were rung upon the fact that Mr. Tallafiero, before a committee, testified that he believed Hoover was going to keep his word to the American packers. Now, what was his word? I say that what Congress did with regard to wheat is analogous to what he did with regard to hogs and pork, equally necessary in the war. What he did was almost exactly the same, barring the greater difficulties of the situation.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HARDWICK. Is there not this difference: When the President fixed the price of wheat for 1920 he did so under express authority of law. Did Mr. Hoover have any warrant of law to fix the price of pork at that time?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. I wish the Senator would cite it. I am very much interested in that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am coming to that.

Now, Congress had provided for wheat; but early in the war it was discovered that, while we had a normal crop of wheat, the condition of the hog supply in the United States was very alarming. We went into the year 1917, at the time we declared war, with 7,000,000 less hogs in the United States than we had the previous year—a very material shortage of hogs. What could Hoover do to stimulate the production of hogs? Hoover was the man to whom the administration of the United States and the administrations of the associated nations—Great Britain, France, and Italy—intrusted the power to buy their food products; and he has used that power, as well as the authority given him by Congress, to control the packers to a large extent in the supply of food.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like not to be interrupted for a few minutes.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will kindly cite his authority for the power, I shall be obliged to him.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not want to consider quibbles or technicalities. I am talking of broad facts.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is not a quibble.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator can make his own speech as to the authority.

Mr. HARDWICK. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What he has done he has done, and it has been done well, and he has saved the country by furnishing food.

Now, I want to get back to February, 1918; and I want to read the letter addressed by President Wilson to Mr. Hoover on that date:

MY DEAR MR. HOOVER: May I not call your attention to this important point:

There is pressing need of the full cooperation of the packing trade, of every officer and employee, in the work of hurrying provisions abroad. Let the packers understand that they are engaged in a war

service, in which they must take orders and act together under the direction of the Food Administration, if the Food Administration requires.

Cordially and sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

That came from the President. It called Mr. Hoover's attention to the fact that it was his duty to take supervision over the great food supply of the United States and stimulate it.

As I have said, here was this shortage of 7,000,000 hogs as compared with 1916. What could Hoover do to stimulate that production? There was a German propaganda in this country—at least, there was propaganda which was called German, and I suspect it may have been—which went all over the country, that Mr. Hoover was going to try to hold down the price of hogs to \$10; and it was necessary for Mr. Hoover to send out circulars, copies of which I have here, denying that fact, and averring that it was not the policy of his administration to restrict the prices of those products which the world needed below the point where they could be produced.

Mr. Hoover first made his Food Administration organization. He gathered here men from all over the country, skilled in various lines, acquainted with various lines of production. He appointed a food administrator in every State; and I will say that in my State he appointed the man best qualified to discharge its duties, and who sacrificed at it, and did an able service in organizing the people of Nebraska in support of Mr. Hoover; and I presume he did it in other States. He gathered a body here in Washington, numbering at the maximum, something like 1,400 people. He brought in men, advisers from all over the country. He took in also as his advisers the best men in the Department of Agriculture. He took in an officer from the Quartermaster's Department.

He brought in here committees from time to time and producers from every State in the Union—I mean hog producers and cattle producers and agricultural producers generally. He held these meetings repeatedly with these various interests. He brought packers and producers together under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture representatives and his own. The result of those conferences was the development of a plan for the stimulation of the raising of hogs to meet the immediate demand.

There were various plans considered. First, they had to take into account the price of hogs, the price of corn, when the price of wheat was raised, established by the guaranty of Congress; and the effort was made to use various substitutes. We all remember how the price of corn advanced. The hog producers first averred that they would be satisfied with the ratio of 13 to 1; that is, 13 bushels of corn to 100 pounds of hog. It was considered that that would be a fair ratio. But then other changes came in which made that difficult to maintain.

At the first meeting which took a definite conclusion there were something like 50 or 60 persons present. It has been said that it was behind closed doors, but it was a meeting of packers and hog raisers and representatives of the Agricultural Department and provision men and Mr. Hoover's own representative. The result of that first conference in October, 1917, when they had this shortage of 7,000,000 hogs, was to establish a certain price which ought to be paid at the stockyards by these packers for the hogs that they bought; that is to say, it was said that the minimum price—I think it was 15½ cents per pound, live weight—should be paid for hogs in order to induce the farmers of the country to increase the supply.

Now, as the purchaser of the products from the packers, Mr. Hoover was in a position to say to them, "You shall pay 15½ cents per pound for those hogs, live weight." When that word went out to the country the result was a stimulation of the production of hogs, and from month to month the packers paid those prices, and from month to month Mr. Hoover, as the representative of three or four of the greatest nations in the world, paid the packers for their products.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Nebraska has very correctly stated what occurred in the fall of 1917. Of course similar arrangements were made throughout subsequent months. But what I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska is this: If hogs are worth \$15.50 a hundred, how much is the packing-house product worth? In other words, did the packers sell the products and derive a greater profit from the sale of the products than they ought to have done?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will come to that.

Mr. CUMMINS. I hope the Senator will.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Congress did not intrust Mr. Hoover with power to control the prices of packing-house products. He could not do it. All that he could do was through his power as a purchasing agent to say what he would pay for certain prod-

ucts, namely, these food products. He did have some power which he exercised to limit the profits that the packers could earn upon food products, and he did it. He could not limit the profits they made on their by-products. Therefore he could not control their total profits in any way at all. All he could do was to say how much they could make on their food products, and he did it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Did Mr. Hoover have authority, or did he not, to license the packers and prescribe the terms upon which they could do business?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. He did as far as food products were concerned, and he did it. He limited their profits to 9 per cent on food products, but he could not tell what they should make on glue.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator contend that Mr. Hoover did not have the power to extend the license to their entire business?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes. He did not have any jurisdiction over it.

Mr. BORAH. Where is the power which confined his operation or his jurisdiction to food products? He could take in their entire business under the license system just the same as he could take any part of it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I will leave the Senator to struggle with his technicalities. The fact was that Congress intrusted Mr. Hoover with the power. There was a great deal of question how far the power went, and many of the Senators on the other side who have been attacking him objected to the very power that Congress vested in him, and limited it.

There was a limitation on the power, but he exercised it in good faith. He told the packers practically that they must pay, to begin with, 15½ cents a pound, because he had to have the pigs. He told them they could not earn more than 9 per cent on their capital in the production of their food products. That is as far as he could go, and he did it.

Mr. Hoover is about through with the packers, and when the American Congress undertake to handle the great packing interests of the country they will probably find, as Mr. Hoover found, that it is a very difficult task, and will need as much sympathy as we should give Mr. Hoover. He had a great many sleepless nights and a great many hard struggles in dealing with that mighty combine.

Mr. CUMMINS. As far as I am concerned, I do not want my question to be construed into any sympathy with the effort to fix prices anywhere upon anything.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I know that very well, from the Senator's position.

Mr. STERLING. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if Mr. Hoover's only power was not derived from the food-control act of 1917?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is his only legislative power, but I have already pointed out what power he had as purchasing agent of the various Governments.

Mr. STERLING. Food, feed, and fuel are named as the necessities in the food-control act over which the power to license is given.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. His legislative powers were limited to those, and the packers had a very large business entirely outside of his jurisdiction, and made a great many profits outside of his jurisdiction.

But, Mr. President, I say Mr. Hoover did his duty when he called these representative people here and made his program, an intelligent program, an effective program, because the result of that program has been to increase the supply of the hogs of the country to such an extent that the receipts have almost swamped the packing houses within the last few months.

Mr. President the packing houses are under obligation to continue to pay the prices which have now been raised to 17½ cents per pound live weight, and because the packing houses are under obligation to continue paying 17½ cents per pound for hogs until March, was not Mr. Taliaferro justified in saying that he believed Mr. Hoover was going to keep his word with the packing houses as long as they kept their word with the country? They are buying hogs at the rate of thirty or forty thousand a day and paying these prices, and I do not know but it is more than that. I noticed that the purchases in Chicago alone the other day were about 30,000. They are paying these prices.

Do you want the country to announce to the packing houses that they need not fulfill their obligations until the end of this hog season? Do you want the price of those hogs broken? I say Mr. Hoover has done the right thing, and he is doing it in Europe now, because he is not only keeping his word to the packers but he is requiring Great Britain to keep her word.

I have in my hand a telegram received by the United Press this morning, dated Paris, and I shall read it for what light it may throw on the subject:

PARIS, January 23.

Herbert Hoover to-day flatly denied the charges made in the United States Senate, during debate on the \$100,000,000 food bill, that he had worked in the interest of American packing industry. Hoover ridiculed the idea that he had benefited the big packers.

He declared he worked to give American farmers a square deal and protect small packers.

The attack on Hoover in the Senate was made by enemies of the bill providing \$100,000,000 to feed Europeans other than inhabitants of the central powers. Hoover was assailed as the man who would have charge of spending this money.

"I apparently emerge in a new light as the friend of the Chicago packers," said Hoover. "At the same time the mail brings a report from Swift & Co., blaming the Food Administration for reducing their profits by \$10,000,000 during the last year. I don't imagine the packers would appreciate a wide circle of such friends."

"I notice also I committed a crime by holding the October joint conference of farmers and representatives of 40 packers, as well as bringing the packers together with representatives of the allied Governments for the purpose of settling on a price for exports of pork that would give the American farmers a square deal, and a distribution of orders that would protect small packers."

"We have even tried to secure the continuance of these war arrangements through the armistice period."

That is the arrangement with Great Britain and France and Italy for the purchase of these products, and why not? The hogs were raised. The farmers kept their word. Shall the packers not keep their word with the farmers? Shall the nations not keep their word with the packers simply because they have concluded a war sooner than they expected?

Mr. Hoover continues:

"We have even tried to secure the continuance of these war arrangements through the armistice period and the opening of other markets, because the American farmer did his duty and produced the goods."

"If the small farmer and American packer now feel that these arrangements are wrong, it would be the greatest burden off our shoulders if we could know it quickly. The British Government is particularly anxious to be relieved from these arrangements."

Mr. KING. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. KING. How long did Mr. Hoover agree that the farmers should receive from the packers 17½ cents per pound, live weight, for hogs? In other words, did he require the packers to contract to purchase up to a given period?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; until March.

Mr. KING. Next March?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Next March.

Mr. KING. The farmers, then, have gone on the theory that they would find a market, and the packers would be compelled to buy all their hogs for that price, until March of this year?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. They have; and the price was such that it stimulated the production to such an extent that, as I said, it has almost swamped the packers to take the hogs that came to market.

Mr. WADSWORTH. What was the price fixed?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was originally fixed at 15½ cents, then raised to 16 cents, because of the advance in the price of corn; for the last month or two it has been 17½ cents; and on the 28th of this month there will gather in Washington another conference for the purpose of fixing it for the next month.

Mr. President, that is about all I have to say. I have taken the bull squarely by the horns and the hog squarely by the ears. I say Hoover is right. If he told the packers they were under obligation to buy these hogs at this price until March, he is under obligations as the representative of the United States, Great Britain, France, and Italy to see that they get a fair price for their product. It is just as important for us to keep our word to the packers as it would be to keep our word to the farmers or anybody else; and I say that this attack, therefore, on this bill, this attack on a man who is off in Europe, is a stab in the back which is utterly unworthy. There is not an official of the United States who has rendered greater services than Mr. Hoover has done; and, to my mind, it is an outrageous thing during his absence to make these attacks which do reflect upon his honor and his character, notwithstanding the disclaimer Senators make.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, one really good thing deserves to be followed by another. One of the best speeches I ever heard made in the United States Senate I have just listened to by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. One of the best things I ever saw in public print appeared this morning in the Washington Post from the pen of ex-President Taft. It is entitled, "Taft says success of treaty of peace depends on league." I have risen for the purpose of asking permission to insert in the RECORD this letter of Mr. Taft's, published this morning in the Post. I shall not take up the time of the Senate with having it read. I ask unanimous consent to insert it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

TAFT SAYS SUCCESS OF TREATY OF PEACE DEPENDS ON LEAGUE—ONLY THROUGH UNION OF GREAT NATIONS CAN WORLD BE SURE OF ENJOYING FRUITS OF ALLIED VICTORY—INTERNATIONAL POLICE TO BECOME IN TIME A MERE POTENTIAL FORCE.

[By William Howard Taft.]

The expressions at the peace conference of President Poincaré and Premier Clemenceau in reference to the league of nations, and the published rules of the congress, are reassuring to those who look to the growth of an effective and real league out of the situation. The French leaders see clearly, and say with emphasis, that we have a league of nations now and that it must be maintained in order to achieve the purpose of the war. The circumstances of the struggle forced the allies into an interallied council and then into a common command of the armies under Foch; but for that the war might not have been won. Now the situation after peace will be so complicated and critical that similar unity of action between the five great nations who fought the war will be necessary to enable them and the world to enjoy the fruits of victory and the hardly won prize.

GUARDIANS OF WORLD'S WELFARE.

The rules of the congress recognize that the five great nations—Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and the United States—are the ones which have an interest in all questions coming before the congress as guardian of the welfare of the world, made so by the logic of their winning the war. They are thus established as the initiating nucleus of a world union, as the charter members of a league of nations.

It is to be noted that the league of nations is the first subject to be considered by the congress. This seems to be at variance with the views of James M. Beck and Senators LODGE and KNOX. Mr. Beck argues that as our fathers waited five years after winning independence before making a Constitution the nations ought to be equally deliberate in discussing and framing a constitution for the world. Most people will agree after reading the description by Hamilton and Madison of conditions existing in the interval between our independence and the convention of 1787 that it would have been much better if the convention could have been called earlier. Of course, it may be said that the state of affairs during the interval was necessary to bring the people to see the necessity for a stronger government. But surely Mr. Beck would not wish a recurrence of the quarrels of nations and another war to convince the peoples of the world of the necessity and advantage of world unity to suppress war and maintain peace. It is now just after this horrible war, when its agonies, its sufferings, its losses, its inhuman character, all are fresh in the minds of men that they will be willing to go farther in making the needed and proper concessions involved in a useful, real league of nations. Delay will dull their eagerness to adopt the machinery essential to organized protection against war.

NO SECURITY WITHOUT LEAGUE.

But another fact which Mr. Beck and Mr. KNOX seem to ignore is that a treaty of peace can not be made at Paris by which the peace of Europe can be secured and maintained without a league of nations. These gentlemen may well be challenged to tell us what arrangements they would suggest to the five nations engaged in framing this treaty for peace and making it work, unless it be by a continuing league of those five nations to maintain it.

How can the objects and purposes of the 14 points, especially those directed to rearranging the map of eastern and central Europe and Asia Minor, be achieved and carried to peaceful realization except through a league of nations embracing the five great powers? No one opposed to the league of nations idea has essayed to answer this very practical question. The Paris conference is confronted with it and must answer it. It has answered it suggestively by making the league of nations the first subject of discussion.

Premier Clemenceau said: "The league of nations is here, it is for you to make it live."

Senator LODGE, in his speech, fully recognized the existence of the league of great nations in the war and the necessity for its continuance. Indeed, it is probable that if Senator KNOX and Mr. Beck were cross-examined, their admissions would show them to be not very far removed from the view that something substantially equivalent to a league of great nations must be definitely formed by this Congress with agreed-upon means of enforcing the stipulated peace.

NEGATION NOT VERY HELPFUL.

The Associated Press informs us that a league of nations is in the forming, but that the supersovereignty of an international police force is to be rejected as part of it. This negation is not very helpful. Except in Tennyson's poetic vision and in the plans of impracticables, no such suggestion as supersovereignty has been advanced. The proposed structure of the league, common to the plans proposed officially by the French and English commissions on the subject and by our own official league to enforce peace, embraces a court, a council of conciliation, an administrative branch to carry on international trusts like the government of Constantinople, and an executive council. It further includes an agreement on the part of the great nations to combine forces when an exigency arises either to compel warring nations to submit differences to the court or conciliating council, or to go further and to enforce the judgment and deal with the recommendations of the council of conciliation as may be deemed wise by the executive council of the league.

INTERNATIONAL POLICE FORCE.

Most opponents of the league idea have assumed that the so-called international police is to be a permanent body under an international commander and subject to orders without invoking consent of the nations contributing to the force. This is a great misconception. A potential international police force will be created by an agreement of the great nations to furnish forces when necessary to accomplish a legitimate purpose of the league. In most instances, no actual force will need to be raised. The existence of an agreement and confidence that the nations will comply with it is all that will be needed. Nations who have judgments against them in a court of the nations will generally perform them. It will only be where defiances of such judgments will lead to a dangerous war that the league force need be raised.

Of course, during the interval after the conclusion of peace the possibility of differences and the danger of Bolshevism may require a retention of some of the war army strength of the allies to see the treaty through to its effective execution. But after normal times come again, the strength of the league to secure compliance with the treaty obliga-

tions and justice will not be in its serried columns, but in its potential power under the joint agreement.

DIVISION OF WORLD INTO ZONES.

In the convenient division of the world into zones in which the respective great powers shall undertake the responsibility of seeing to it that members of the league conform to the rules laid down by the treaty, it will be unnecessary for any nation to send forces to a distant quarter. The United States can properly take care of the Western Hemisphere and need not maintain in normal times a military establishment more extensive than she ought to maintain for domestic use and the proper maintenance of the Monroe doctrine without such a league. This may be well supplied not by a professional army but by a system of universal training of democratic principles, like that of Switzerland or New Zealand. If this be conscription, its opponents may make the most of it. It will help our boys in discipline of character and in a most useful educational way. It will provide for the prompt display of democratic power to achieve justice. The picture painted by Senator BORAH of the Army of the United States needed for the purposes of the league is the result of a lively imagination, but does not find support in the real need of the league.

After the league of the great powers has been established for the purpose of executing the plans of the new treaty, it will be time enough to take in all other responsible powers. The lesser league will grow naturally into a larger league. Experience will test the practical character of the lesser league and in this wise and in due course the world league will come into being. But meanwhile as a necessary condition precedent to the success of the treaty of peace it must provide for a league of the great nations.

AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, on the day before yesterday I made an announcement that on Thursday—to-day—I would seek an opportunity to address the Senate on the American Expeditionary Forces. It is quite possible that such an address would assume some length. The bill before the Senate and now under consideration is of such vast importance, however, and the determination of the issue at an early hour is so desirable that I do not intend to-day to interrupt the proceedings. In the event that the bill under consideration is passed to-day, I shall seek an opportunity to address the Senate to-morrow. If the bill is not passed to-day, I shall seek an opportunity to address the Senate on Tuesday next.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 14516) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 10663) to convey a strip of land on the site of the Federal building at Princeton, Ind., and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of Local Union No. 106, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths and Helpers, of Bay City, Mich., praying for the proposed extension of Federal control of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry Italian citizens of Calumet, Mich., praying that the allies' representatives at the peace conference settle the boundary dispute between Italy and Austria-Hungary, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Education of Albion, Mich., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Presque Isle, Me., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SHAFROTH presented petitions of the Trades and Labor Assembly, of the Labor Bulletin, of the Building Trades Council, and of Local Union No. 229, Federation of Postal Employees, all of Denver, in the State of Colorado, praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona presented telegrams in the nature of petitions from the Federal Employees' Union of Tucson, Ariz., Cincinnati, Ohio, Albuquerque, N. Mex., Boston, Mass., Charleston, S. C., Montgomery, Ala., Bangor, Me., New Orleans, La., Omaha, Nebr., New Haven, Conn., Atlanta, Ga., Providence, R. I., Dover, N. J., Louisville, Ky., Helena, Mont., Occoquan, Va., Norfolk, Va., Sioux City, Iowa, Des Moines, Iowa, St. Louis, Mo., Kansas City, Mo., Philadelphia, Pa., Pittsburgh, Pa., Wichita, Kans., Fort Leavenworth, Kans., Chicago, Ill., Rock Island, Ill., Detroit, Mich., Port Huron, Mich., Niagara Falls, N. Y., Rochester, N. Y., Brooklyn, N. Y., Milwaukee, Wis., Hayward, Wis., El Paso, Tex., Brownsville, Tex., San Diego, Cal., San Francisco, Cal., Vallejo, Cal., Spokane, Wash., Seattle, Wash.,

Duluth, Minn., St. Paul, Minn.; of A. C. Weiss, publisher of the Chicago Herald; of sundry Treasury custodian employees of Newark, N. J.; of sundry employees in the Immigration Service, of Chicago; of sundry employees of the customhouse and naval office of Chicago; of sundry employees of the United States Employment Service of Chicago; of the Custom Inspectors' Association of Chicago; of sundry employees of the United States appraisers' stores, of Chicago; of sundry employees of the United States Forest Service, of Missoula, Mont.; of the State Federation of Labor of Kentucky; and of the Trades Assembly of Duluth, Minn., praying for the proposed dollar-a-day increase in salaries of Federal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12210) to amend the act of May 14, 1898, as amended by the act of March 3, 1903, entitled "An act to extend the homestead laws and to regulate the sale and entry of public lands along the shores of navigable waters in Alaska," reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 657) thereon.

Mr. SHAFROTH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5989) to grant certain lands to the town of Olathe, Colo., for the protection of its water supply, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 656) thereon.

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Finance, to which was recommended the bill (S. 2496) for the refund of duties paid on materials destroyed by fire, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 658) thereon.

AMERICAN SOLDIERS' CEMETERY IN FRANCE.

Mr. SPENCER. I ask that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 5313) authorizing the Secretary of War to acquire and maintain a cemetery in France in the name of the United States for the reception and interment of the bodies of American officers and men who lost their lives in connection with the European war, and to appropriate \$500,000 therefor, and for other purposes, and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The chairmen of both committees are agreeable to this action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

PROHIBITION IN THE CANAL ZONE.

Mr. THOMPSON. On December 15, 1918, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] introduced a bill (S. 5224) to prohibit intoxicating liquors and prostitution within the Canal Zone, and for other purposes, and it was erroneously referred to the Committee on the Philippines. I move that the Committee on the Philippines be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 5412) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the municipalities of Bismarck, Devils Lake, Harvey, Carrington, Jamestown, Dickinson, Forman, Minot, Park River, Bowman, Hettinger, Mott, and Bottineau, in the State of North Dakota, captured German cannon, cannon balls or shells, and gun carriages, condemned United States cannon, cannon balls or shells, and gun carriages; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 5413) to increase and equalize the salaries of veterinarians in the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 5414) requiring The Adjutant General of the United States Army and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain data to the adjutants general of the several States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 5415) requiring The Adjutant General of the United States Army and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain data to the adjutants general of the several States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

A bill (S. 5416) to establish engineering experiment stations for the purpose of further developing that college in each State and Territory now receiving, or which may hereafter receive, the benefits of the act of Congress approved

July 2, 1862, entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," and for the purpose of developing the natural resources of the United States as a measure of industrial, military, and naval preparedness; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 5417) granting a pension to Nathan L. Brass (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5418) granting a pension to Horton G. Mosher (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

A bill (S. 5419) conferring upon tribes of Indians the right to recall their agents or superintendents; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. RANDELL submitted an amendment proposing to increase the salary of the chief clerk, office of Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, from \$2,250 to \$2,750, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WOLCOTT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF LIGNITE COALS.

Mr. HENDERSON. I submit a conference report on the so-called lignite-coals bill, which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3220) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make investigations, through the Bureau of Mines, of lignite coals and peat to determine the practicability of their utilization as a fuel and in producing commercial products, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 2 and 3, and agree to the same.

CHARLES B. HENDERSON,
T. J. WALSH,
MILES POINDEXTER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

M. D. FOSTER,
OTIS WINGO,
E. E. DENISON,

Managers on the part of the House.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 14516. An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 7th instant approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 187) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress.

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF PANAMA CANAL.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on InterOceanic Canals:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Governor of the Panama Canal for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
23 January, 1919.

FOOD SUPPLIES FOR EUROPE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13708) providing for the relief of such populations in Europe and countries contiguous thereto,

outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President as necessary.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have had the greatest difficulty in my effort to reach a conclusion with respect to my attitude upon this measure. I recognize that there are many reasons which can be urged in its behalf, and there are many reasons which seem to me to make against the wisdom of the proposed legislation. I do not think the solution of the problem depends upon Mr. Hoover or the meat packers. Neither his conduct nor theirs has determined the vote which I shall feel constrained ultimately to cast.

Before I enter upon what I regard as the material elements of the case I want the Senator from Virginia or some other Senator to clear up, if it be possible to do it, what seems to be a confusion with respect to the facts in the matter. It is asserted upon the one side, with very great confidence, apparently, that the purpose of the bill is to make a market for foodstuffs especially that will enable Mr. Hoover to maintain the prices which have prevailed with regard to commodities of that kind. It is asserted upon the other that the United States has now in Europe foodstuffs and other supplies that can be furnished under the bill aggregating in value \$55,000,000, accumulated there for war purposes, and that we have in this country as well as in Europe a large quantity of wheat for which there is no apparent market, and it is intended by those who are to administer the bill that the \$100,000,000 thus sought to be appropriated shall be simply turned into the Treasury of the United States in alleged payment of property which already belongs to the United States.

I want to know which of these contradictory statements is true, if anyone here, either the chairman of the committee or any of the Senators who have brought forward the other view of it, is able to clarify the situation.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I am suffering from a bronchial throat trouble and am really incapacitated from taking any considerable part in the debate on this bill. Indeed, my physician warned me that I ought not to leave my apartment to-day, and certainly ought not to engage in debate. I am not going to undertake to do it, but I really want to answer the Senator's question.

I say there has not been one single word found in a cablegram from the American commission or the President or Mr. Hoover which undertook to state that this money was asked in order to maintain the price of any product. On the contrary, it was to relieve the starvation and suffering of our friends in European countries. That is the only reason given for it. It has been stated that in meeting that great moral obligation it would incidentally make a market for American products, but the market for American products was not the inducement. The money was not asked for that purpose. The money was asked for the sole purpose of relieving suffering and starvation among our friends in European countries. Incidentally, it was stated, it would make a market for some of our products. Incidentally, it was stated, it would discourage Bolshevism and disorder in European countries, because we all know that men who are starving are in a condition of lawlessness and disorder. We can not expect orderly government from a starving people.

An allusion was made to the indirect and incidental benefit in the way of restoring peace and order in foreign countries, and, also incidentally, that it would create a market for our products; but the motive, the reason, the cause for asking this appropriation of \$100,000,000 is to relieve starvation and suffering in European countries among the friends of the United States and our allies.

Mr. CUMMINS. Just one moment further. The question which I have asked—and possibly I did it rather awkwardly—was, Has the United States these supplies on hand now, accumulated for war purposes, and is the appropriation which it is now proposed to make to be returned to the Treasury of the United States in exchange for those supplies?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, as I understand, the tribunal which is known as the supreme council of food supplies—I may not give the name correctly—which has been organized under the council of war of the allied nations in Europe, will have the disposition of this matter. They are to go on the market and buy supplies to relieve this starvation and this suffering. There is no string to it whatever. They are not required to spend the money for supplies in the United States, but they are to spend it. Finding that my throat was in such condition that it was impossible for me to talk without great discomfort, I handed the list of the personnel of this commission to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KERLOGG]; but I will merely say that that personnel includes Lord Reading and some other distinguished statesmen; that it includes the most distinguished statesmen of France. The Italian

representatives have not yet arrived. Pending their arrival a very distinguished Italian will represent Italy in this supreme council for relief, and Mr. Hoover and Mr. Davis are representing the United States. That council of eight, representing the four great belligerents, have selected Mr. Hoover as president. They are to determine where and how these supplies shall be bought. The money is not to be expended in the market of any particular country. Incidentally, it will inure to the advantage of the United States, particularly in meat products, because the United States is the only country that has a surplus of meat products. However, the United States also has a large supply of wheat on hand that was acquired under this order fixing the limit of price; but whether this money is invested in that wheat or not will depend on the food council, which, as I have said, is composed of eight of the most distinguished men of this country and of the countries of our allies abroad. They are to determine where this money shall be spent. It is to be spent not to create a market anywhere, not to stop Bolshevism anywhere, but it is to be spent to relieve suffering and starvation among our friends in European countries. In doing that incidentally it will make some market for our products and incidentally it will tend to suppress disorder and Bolshevism.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am not interested at this moment in the personnel of the commission which is to manage and distribute the supplies. What I should like to know—and the information does not seem to be accessible—is, Does this bill in fact simply donate property which the United States now has and for which it seems to have no immediate use, or is it intended to be expended in the purchase of food supplies and other supplies which are yet in the hands of private owners?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I thought I made that clear. It is to be used by going on the market and buying these food supplies where the object in view will be best conserved—the relief of suffering and starvation among our friends in Europe. The appropriation is not to be made to take off the hands of the United States Government anything that it has. Whether it will do so or not is to be determined by that commission, which is composed of eight of the most distinguished men in the world. It is not limited to any particular use, but that commission is to determine when, how, and where this money shall be expended, with only this proviso, that the object of spending it is to relieve the starvation and suffering in European countries.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am very much obliged to the Senator from Virginia. I am plagued with the thought that he may exceed his strength, and I hope that he will not continue any effort he is making at the risk of his health. That is a heartfelt wish on my part.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is a considerable strain on my throat or I would have been more active in the debate; but I will try not to participate in it any further.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KELLOGG. I suppose that the Senator from Iowa knows that the Government of the United States, through the wheat corporation, is obligated to take the crop of wheat for 1918; that it has purchased all the surplus which has been offered on the market; that it now owns it, is selling it to European countries, and has already sold a large amount of it.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Iowa knows that. That was the very point of my inquiry. If we are simply donating to the commission or to the helpless people of eastern Europe a certain quantity of material which we have on hand and for which we have no present use, that is one thing; and if that were the purpose, we ought not to pass an appropriation bill; we ought to pass a bill for the donation of these supplies, naming them, to the commission in Europe for such distribution as they may see fit to bring about. While I do not say that is the chief reason that will constrain me to vote against this bill, it is one of the things about the measure which is very repugnant to me.

It does not seem to me a fair, open, and candid movement upon the part of the Government. The purpose evidently is to take the \$100,000,000 which we shall appropriate, if we do appropriate it, and pay it into the Treasury of the United States for material which the country has accumulated in this way. I can easily see that there may be consequences in pursuing a course of that kind that would not be possible if the appropriation were to be used, or is to be used, in the purchase of material still in the hands of private persons or corporations. It is not right for the President or Mr. Hoover or anyone else to come before Congress for an appropriation of \$100,000,000 to be expended in that way if the purpose is simply a gift on the part of the United States of the material which we have accumulated in this war or through the obligations of the war and which we now desire to dispose of in some way or other.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I call the Senator's attention to a fact which he already knows, that the bill provides that the money which is advanced shall be returned to the Government of the United States; or, in other words, it is to be used as a revolving fund. I can not see how it will be possible to carry out the theory of the bill if we donate so much pork or so many cases of corn or beans or so many bushels of wheat. I will admit, Mr. President—and I shall frankly say so when I speak upon this bill—that I do not believe that the Government of the United States is going to receive back the hundred million dollars which it donates now as a revolving fund. It will receive back some part of it; but no one can tell what part it will receive. Wherever the money is advanced for the relief of a people who have an organized form of government, that government is to give its obligation for the return of this money; but I believe the bulk of it is going to sources that will never return the money advanced for buying food products for their relief, and I shall never expect it to be returned to the Government of the United States; indeed, if I vote for this measure I shall be greatly surprised if we get 50 per cent of it back.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have not viewed it from that aspect at all. I do not expect that we will be repaid for any considerable part of the advance we now make, but I see no difficulty whatever in adjusting the sale of property to these foreign Governments to the idea suggested by the Senator from Utah. Suppose we have an automobile over there—that is one of the things that we are going to try to dispose of—a large number of motor trucks, automobiles, railroad iron, locomotives, and everything else the people in the eastern part of Europe need for their reconstruction. That is the reason the phrase "urgent supplies" is found in the bill; and I am not criticizing that especially, because I think they need all these things probably quite as much as they need food in order to set them on their way in a prosperous direction. But if the United States wants to sell an automobile to the Serbian Government, and the Serbian Government is able now to give it an obligation, it can sell it for what it is worth and take the obligation of that Government for that amount; but if we make an appropriation in money and that is intended simply to reimburse the Government of the United States for the supplies that have been accumulated, then they will go to the Governments which are to be benefited by the act or to the individuals which are to be benefited by the act at the exaggerated prices representing their cost to the United States. I do not want to qualify or surround this act of charity and mercy with any thought that these people must make good to the United States the cost of the war in which we have been engaged. If we are intending to give them the help which is indicated here, we ought to give it so that they will know that, if they return obligations to us, their obligations will represent the real value of the thing given, or, if it is a donation, that they receive the full benefit of the money which we appropriate for that purpose. I fear very much that in this ledgerdom of bookkeeping and in the transmutation of this money into materials or supplies or food a large part of the objects which we have in view will be neutralized, and, not only so, but that in future years we will be subject to very great reproach for having resorted to an indirect method of alleviating misery.

Mr. President, I desire to say, in response to the Senator from Nebraska, that I concur with him in his proposition that the United States must keep faith with the packers and with the farmers, and it does not tend to bring my mind to an adverse conclusion to say that before the peace conference assembled in Europe it was understood in America that faith should be kept. I know something about the meetings that were held in Chicago and elsewhere that had for their purpose the stimulation of the production in America of hogs and of wheat. I would have thought this Government faithless, as many of us did think it faithless, if it failed to carry out the arrangement that was made in the fall of 1917 with the farmers in my State. It did not perform that obligation just as it should have performed it; it did not comply with the exact obligation into which it entered at that time; but there was a fair show of performance, and it had its full effect.

I agree that when the Food Administration required the packers to pay \$15.50 for 100 pounds of live hog it entered into an implied agreement that the packers, so far as the Government could control, should be permitted to sell their product at a price that would yield a fair profit upon that basis; and when in October, 1918—I think it was October, 1918—a similar meeting occurred in Chicago, and there were representatives of my own State there—some of the most prominent live-stock producers in the country were there from my own State—and it was agreed at that meeting that the farmers should have and

the packers should pay \$17.50 per hundred pounds for live hogs, the commonest honesty required that the Government that took part in that proceeding should redeem its obligations. That agreement has been continued from time to time, until now it expires on the 1st day of February. It ought to be kept, and whatever is a fair price for packing-house products, upon the basis of live stock at the rates which I have suggested, ought to be maintained if the influence of the Government can maintain such prices.

I do not understand, however, that the criticism of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] or the criticism of my colleague [Mr. KENYON] upon the subject is based upon any suggestion that bad faith should creep into a vital transaction of that kind. If I understood the Senator from Idaho, his criticism is that, even upon the basis of expenditure controlling the price of live stock, the packers made more profit in 1918 than they ever made before in the history of their enterprises, and that they made more profit in 1917 than they had ever made in any year prior to that time. That is the criticism. It is not that the Government should not help sustain fair and honest and reasonable prices which grow out of the promises with regard to live stock; but what justification is there for fixing a price upon packing-house products that would permit Armour & Co. in 1918 to earn a profit of \$15,000,000 upon a capitalization which in itself was accumulated by the profits of previous years in the business?

I do not think it is fair to condemn the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] or my colleague [Mr. KENYON] because they think that the prices of these products during these years were too high. I do not know enough about the details of the business even to suggest how much too high they were, but the results in war times were too great; and I think that any man who has the love of country in his heart and who wanted and wants to be helpful in the solution of these great problems which are rushing on us in time of peace must agree that the first duty of the American Congress, as well as the American Executive so far as his power extends, is to devise some policy, is to create some system of regulation, that will prevent consequences and results of the kind I have indicated; and instead of trying to establish sovereignties in Europe, with the attending obligation to maintain and protect those sovereignties, the whole force of the American mind, represented in the Executive and in Congress, should be turned to the solution of these problems which not only confront us but which ought to frighten every thoughtful American citizen.

I say this with regard to the distribution of this largess, because I do not intend to found my objection to the bill or my vote against the bill upon the fact that Mr. Hoover is to distribute it. I do not know whether he is entitled to the glowing eulogy pronounced upon him by the Senator from Nebraska or not. He may be. I, at least, have never found anything in his conduct to indicate that he was not guided by a desire to help the American people, and I can have no doubt that he has the same purpose now. Do not think that this means that I agree with everything he has done, for I think that he or those under him have done as foolish things as ever marred the industrial record of a great country. But that is simply a matter of judgment and does not impugn the good faith or intent of those who were administering our laws.

Mr. President, if we believe that the proposed appropriation ought not to be administered by Mr. Hoover, it can be administered by somebody else. The Senate has it in its power to appoint the persons who shall administer its appropriation, if it desires to do so. I mention that simply to indicate that my objection to the bill does not spring out of the fact that Mr. Hoover or Mr. Davis or anyone else who may be specified are not the proper persons to distribute the fund.

A great deal has been said with regard to the character of the appropriation. What is it? Some have thought it is to be a charity. Even the Senator from Virginia emphasized that phase of the question. I do not think it is a charity. I do not think it has any semblance of a charity. I do not mean to say that its effect, when distributed among these people, would not be charity; but we are not asked to make this appropriation simply because it is a charitable, philanthropic thing to do. We are asked to make this appropriation because it becomes, or it is said to become, a part of the negotiations for peace in Europe. We are asked to make it because it is said to be necessary in order to enable the President of the United States to accomplish the purpose he has in mind.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. Just a moment; and I say here, lest I omit it a little later, that if I were in sympathy with the thing which the President proposes to do in Europe I would have no hesitation whatever in voting for the appropriation.

I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KNOX. I merely want to ask the Senator from Iowa if he will not, before he finishes, indicate where it may be found that the proposition is connected in any way with the war?

Mr. CUMMINS. I will. The question, though, is a little misleading. I did not say "connected with the war." I said "connected with the peace."

Mr. KNOX. Well, I meant the same thing. It grows out of the war.

Mr. CUMMINS. I may as well do it now. I will come to it a little later; but, so that the Senator from Pennsylvania may fully understand what I mean by the words I have used, I observe that the President—and in that respect he is associated with Great Britain and France and Italy—believes that the peace conference should establish—peacefully, I suppose, if possible, but forcibly, if necessary—certain sovereignties in eastern and southern Europe—there are at least 10 of them—and that the United States, together with Great Britain, France, and Italy, should not only establish these sovereignties but should guarantee their maintenance, their protection, their safety; and he intends—and he makes no secret of it; it is as open as any utterance which he ever made, or which the statesmen of Europe ever made—to bind the United States to the maintenance and safety of these sovereignties which are to encircle the old Empire of Germany.

I am not going even to enter upon the question as to whether that may not be the highest duty that falls upon Great Britain, France, and Italy, for they are in Europe; but I question and I challenge the propriety or wisdom of such an undertaking upon the part of the United States. I am not in favor of it; I have no sympathy with it, and I will not vote for an appropriation which is intended to usher in that kind of obligation upon the part of the United States. There is not a Senator here who votes for this appropriation who is not committed then and thenceforth to the plan which the President of the United States has so eloquently and so graphically and so explicitly set forth again and again with regard to the relations which should exist between the United States and these new sovereignties which are to be erected in Europe.

This money, as I understand—and I now come to the question of the Senator from Pennsylvania—this money the President says is needed in order to enable these sovereignties which are to be set up to resist the advances of bolshevism, and thus to be more easily and quickly established. Now, if it is our duty to establish and care for and defend them in the days that are to come, I am willing to accept the judgment of the President with regard to the effect of this appropriation. I am willing to assume that the \$100,000,000 which we propose to expend is really necessary to enable this thing to be done. If I want the United States to enter into that relation with Europe, then I should be for the appropriation, and no one ought to question it; but if I am opposed to assuming that attitude toward the affairs of Europe, then I can not in good conscience vote for the appropriation, unless I do it for purely charitable and philanthropic reasons.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, has not the Senator narrowed too much the statement of the President with respect to the rise and spread and operations of bolshevism? As I understand the Senator, he construes the statement of the President to mean that he desires to restrain the operations of bolshevism in the new governments that may be erected out of the central powers. As I understand the statement of the President, he indicates that bolshevism is spreading westward, is poisoning Germany, and that it may prevent the stabilization of Germany, the erection of a government there with which we may negotiate a peace and from which we may exact sufficient and proper guaranties.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I do not want to be at all technical in regard to the matter, because I think the President takes a very broad view of these great problems. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] the other day complained of him because he was an idealist. I do not complain of him because he is an idealist, if he is one. I think he is the most intensely practical statesman of this or any other day. He knows just what he wants, and he usually knows how to get it. He began his administration in the belief that the Executive office had not the power that it ought to have; and from that day until this we have seen one step after another deliberately taken by Congress, until now the President is invested, I think, with all the powers that could be conferred upon any Executive under the Constitution of the United States. I have no doubt that he has intended to use these powers for a good purpose. I have no doubt that he believes that he is a fitter custodian of these powers than any other body of men or any other man. But I think we entirely misunderstand his character when we at-

tribute to him idealism at the expense of practicalism. He has accomplished more in the direction in which he set his face and his mind than any other man, either in this generation or in any former generation; and the only criticism, if it be a criticism, is that he has not marched in the right direction, and he has done things that he ought not to have done, and that is my objection to this bill. I do not intend to clothe him, if I can prevent it, with the power to enter into the agreements in regard to the reestablishment of Europe which he thinks the United States should make. If anyone here doubts my view with regard to his conception of the situation there, I hope he will make it known. I say that it is his view that the Jugo-Slavs, the Roumanians, the Ukrainians, the Poles, the Czechoslovaks, the Lithuanians, the Estonians, the Letts, and the Finlanders should be erected into independent sovereignties. I have no doubt he hopes that they will become republics, because I doubt not his fidelity to that fundamental principle, and never have, and I hope I never will be called upon to doubt it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CUMMINS. Just a moment. He knows, and all Europe knows, that when these nations are thus grouped, and thus undertake self-government, they can not stand alone. He knows that many of them are not trained and educated and advanced to the point that will enable them to maintain orderly governments within their several borders. No one appreciates that more than he does, I am sure. No one understands it better than Lloyd George or Clemenceau or the statesmen of Italy.

What is then proposed? It is proposed that if dissensions come from within, or if force comes from without, the United States and Great Britain and France and Italy will undertake to guard and protect them against both internal disorders and exterior assaults.

If you want the United States to undertake to do that, then you ought to vote for this appropriation, because that is its purpose. It can be used, I agree, to forward that purpose. But if you do not believe that America should become enmeshed in the intricacies and in the infinite difficulties of European affairs, then you ought not to vote for the appropriation, because its use must be justified upon that ground or it can not be justified at all.

The real truth is that we are apparently passing into a period in which the distinction between nationalism and internationalism is to be disregarded. To vote for an appropriation of this character means simply that you believe it is just as much your duty to guard, protect, develop, and aid the countries of Europe as to guard, protect, aid, and develop your own country. That is the internationalism of which we hear so much. That is it exactly. The President of the United States has said over and over again in substance that there is no discrimination between the duty of this country to our own people and its duty to all the people of the earth; that we are just as much obliged to fight for liberty in Poland as we are obliged to fight for liberty in the United States; and that we are just as much obliged to maintain the Government of Poland as we are to maintain the Government of the United States. He has very distinguished company in that belief.

Suppose we were asked for an appropriation to aid a rebellion in Ireland, why should we not make an appropriation to pay the expenses of a rebellion in Ireland? Do you not believe that Ireland is entitled to her independence on the same theory exactly that Poland is entitled to her independence, or the Czechoslovaks or the Jugo-Slavs? Tell me a single reason which indicates that the countries in eastern Europe should have their independence which does not prove conclusively that the people of Ireland should have their independence. What is the difference between contributing money for Ireland to pay the expenses of an Irish rebellion and paying the expenses that are necessary to set up a government in Poland?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am a little afraid the Senator's inquiry will provoke a suggestion and the suggestion may be followed by a bill for an appropriation in the interest of Irish independence.

Mr. CUMMINS. My attitude toward any such bill would be exactly the same as it will be toward this bill. Whatever sympathy I may have with the struggles of the people of Ireland for independence, I would no more think of voting an appropriation to pay the army which was intended to accomplish that independence than I would think of voting for this appropriation which is intended to establish sovereignties in eastern Europe. It rests upon exactly the same foundation.

Why not have an appropriation here for India? For 25 years the people of India have been struggling simply to establish the same relation between India and Great Britain that Canada, New Zealand, and Australia enjoy. Why should we not do something there if we are to take charge of the world and see that

justice is done everywhere, to see that self-determination shall prevail everywhere?

Mr. President, it is not a dream, it is a mischievous fancy and a false theory that commits the United States to the guardianship of the world and asks for an appropriation from our people in order to carry out our views of men, eminent men, too, with regard to this subject.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, while the Senator is discussing self-determination, I wonder what he thinks about San Domingo and Nicaragua?

Mr. CUMMINS. The list is long enough now.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am thinking of our own victims now.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think it was Emerson who said that consistency is the hobgoblin of small men and mean minds. By that token there are some men now holding eminent positions who would instantly be acquitted of being either small men or having small minds. I do not insist upon consistency. No individual is consistent and no nation is consistent; but I do insist that we shall not ratify in advance the proposal that is being made in Paris by contributing money to the forwarding of a movement of which that proposal is a part.

I do not object to Great Britain and France and Italy guaranteeing the existence and maintaining these new sovereignties. I have the greatest sympathy with their establishment. I hope they will be so successful that all the world finally will enjoy the blessings of free government. All that I am insisting upon is that it is not our business, that it is not safe for the United States, that it is not tolerable for the United States to enter an undertaking of that kind.

We have one guaranty in existence. It pertains to Cuba, and it was wise. Let the successful nations of Europe undertake the guaranty that may be necessary in order to hold these new nations in their places. It will be an evil day when the United States shall find itself bound to send her soldiers or her Navy into the uttermost parts of the earth in order to reduce the inhabitants of some region to order. It will be an evil day for the United States when, forsaking the vital problems of our own country, we devote ourselves primarily and permanently to the problems of other countries.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. I rose a few moments ago to suggest to the Senator—but that is not what I have risen to suggest now—that I do not think the President has ever stated, officially or otherwise, that he believes each of the Balkan Provinces, including Lithuania and Estonia, should be separate and independent nations. I think the President entertains the view that if the Russian people prefer a united republic because of geographic and ethnographic lines they should be permitted to have it, or if some of the territory that formerly was a portion of the Russian Empire should, because of geographic or ethnographic reasons, segregate itself and set up an independent government, and they shall desire that, they ought to be permitted to work out their own salvation.

I think what the Senator said with respect to the President's view concerning Poland and the Government of the Czechoslovaks and the Jugo-Slavs is entirely accurate, and is based upon statements which he has made.

But if the Senator will pardon me a moment further, does not the Senator think the record of Germany, the multitudinous utterances of her statesmen, warriors, scholars, preachers, and even members of the socialist and proletarian organizations during the war and up until the armistice, and some declarations since, evince a purpose upon the part of the German people not only to rise to power and imperial greatness again, but when they do rise to sufficient strength and power to engage in some punitive expedition against those who have been her adversaries in this conflict? Keeping that view in mind, if that question should be answered affirmatively, is it not the part of wisdom, and would not the allied representatives be guilty of a lack of statesmanship and wisdom if they should not do it, in a prudent and proper and just and righteous way, to encourage the organization of other nations that would hem in, if I may be permitted that expression, Germany, to prevent her from again engaging in warlike activities for the destruction of nations in Europe, and perhaps the destruction of nations in other lands?

Mr. CUMMINS. With the limitation just put upon the statement of the Senator from Utah, of course he is right; but what are righteous measures, what are just measures, what are equitable things for the United States to do? That leaves the whole question open.

It is my opinion that the establishment of lesser sovereignties around Germany, with the privilege upon the part of Germany to arm herself, instead of being an inducement to peace and the

safety of the world from the ambitions of Germany, will be, on the other hand, the easy opportunity for Germany to accomplish her purpose. But I will come in a moment to the German situation. I do not intend to deal with it at length. I will say, though, immediately, that if it is necessary to carry out our purposes against Germany to make this appropriation, then I have no doubt about its wisdom, but from my standpoint the German problem is not difficult and does not involve the expenditure which is here suggested.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. May I direct the Senator's attention again to Ireland for a moment? The Senator has stated that the aspirations of the people of Ireland for independent government are similar to those of Poland. Is there not an essential difference which the Senator apparently overlooked between the situation of Ireland and Poland and these other countries? As a war measure, and for the purpose of bringing the strife to a more speedy termination, we encouraged the subject nations of the central empires to arise and revolt and assert their independence. We encouraged them to revolt against German domination and to set themselves up as independent governments. That was a very proper course in war. These are subject nations of the countries with which we are at war, whom we incited to establish independent governments. Is there not due from us accordingly a somewhat different obligation than that which arises toward the nations which are held subject to our allies?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, of course the parallel between Ireland and, for instance, Poland is not exact. I only drew them together in order to indicate their substantial similarity, so far as our encouragement is concerned. We were fighting Germany, and these people were hostile to Germany, and they rose and declared their independence. I do not remember any encouragement or promise from the United States that carried itself to the extent of saying that "If you will rebel and establish an independent government, we will undertake to defend you against Germany or against any other country with which you may be at war."

Mr. WALSH. I remember no such promise, either; but the Senator will remember that we did encourage them to rise, and, furthermore, it is obligatory upon us, as a matter of course, to insure, so far as we can, ourselves against a recurrence of the aggression of Germany. Poland is created as a buffer State between Russia and Germany, as a safeguard against the domination of Russia by Germany. Would it not be quite proper, as a part of the peace arrangement, to insure such a condition of things in order to prevent the possible recurrence of the aggression of Germany and her effort to dominate the world?

Mr. CUMMINS. I know, Mr. President, that Poland, from the standpoint just suggested by the Senator from Montana, is not to be an independent nation. It is to be a pawn, a buffer. That emphasizes what I said a few moments ago, that when this appropriation is made it carries with it a pledge upon the part of the United States that we will protect Poland, that we will come to its defense if attacked. I suppose it involves also an obligation to bring order in Poland if there are internal dissensions, because in order to enable Poland to perform the office which the Senator from Montana has just suggested, it must stand, it must not be overthrown; and who is to see that it stands, who is to see that it is not overthrown? Among others, the United States.

I am in favor of a league of nations or an alliance of nations to prevent war. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], who so beautifully interprets not only the oracles but the silences of the White House, has on many occasions demonstrated that there ought to be an alliance of nations. I am not in favor of the alliance which was foreshadowed in the many utterances of the President before he went to Europe. I have no doubt he has changed his views in that respect, as all wise men will change their views as circumstances change and conditions are altered. But I am not in favor of any alliance of nations or league of nations which will bind the United States to furnish an army or a navy or put an army or a navy in charge of a supernational or superpower in order to overcome either internal disorders in Poland or defend, for instance, against the assault of the Ukrainians. I am not in favor of an alliance of nations proceeding to that extent, and I understand the President is not now in favor of such an arrangement among the powers of the earth.

Mr. WALSH. Permit me, then, to inquire of the Senator if he is in favor of a league of nations that will prevent the aggression of Germany against Poland and the possible reabsorption of Poland by Germany?

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes. We have an alliance of nations now that ought to prevent Germany from making war on any power. That brings me to just a word about Germany.

Departing from the brilliant rhetoric which has no meaning whatever with regard to making the world safe for democracy, which is as illusory and as temporary as the morning mist, and coming to the real reasons for our entrance into this war and the object which we had to accomplish through the war or by the war, let me say that I agree with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] that the aggravating causes for our war with Germany were the continuous inroads and invasions of American rights upon the sea, the brutal, inhuman, murderous conduct of Germany with respect to our rights and the rights of our citizens upon the sea.

I doubt whether we would have entered the war simply to vindicate those rights, although the Senator from Georgia thought we would. I think we entered the war only when there came to the American people the overwhelming belief that if Germany won in her struggle with Great Britain, France, and Italy she would then turn her arms against the United States and become not only a remote but an instant menace to our institutions and to our liberty. It took the American people a long while to reach that conclusion, but they finally did. They finally did see that Germany and her militarism, her ambitions, meant the overthrow of the United States, her institutions, and her civilization. Our object in entering the war was to end that menace. There is just one way in which we can end it. We won the war. There is just one way in which, so far as Germany is concerned, we can forever remove the fear and the apprehension that urged us into this mighty conflict, and that is to disable Germany, disarm her, and keep her disarmed.

I do not know how long it may require to change the character, the hearts, the hopes, the purposes of the German people, but until the character of that people is changed fundamentally they ought not to be permitted to carry arms save to police their internal affairs. That is the way, from my standpoint, in which we ought to deal with Germany. We ought not to leave her capable of attacking any nation.

Mr. WATSON. In order to get the Senator's viewpoint, I should like to ask him whether or not he means by that that we shall keep our own standing army in Germany until Germany changes her character.

Mr. CUMMINS. No; I do not. I assume that Great Britain, France, and Italy should police Germany, so far as it is necessary to police her. But if Germany, after having agreed to disarm herself and after her fortifications are razed to the ground, after her munitions factories are demolished, and after all her military equipment disappears, then begins to re-create her military establishment, I am willing to go to Europe again to destroy Germany's preparations for another war. I have but one thought, and that is that Germany shall for a long series of years be without an army, without a navy, without a munitions factory, without an establishment that turns out guns or that will enable her to become dangerous to the remainder of the world. We can not do that by establishing a circle of sovereignties around Germany and depending upon them to restrain her ambitions.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOX in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield further to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I understand the Senator from Iowa, however, does not desire that this country shall assume any portion of that burden?

Mr. CUMMINS. I am willing to assume that burden if Germany violates her agreements in that respect or violates the terms we impose upon her. I would not keep a single soldier in Europe for that purpose. I would bring them all home after we have done the thing which I have suggested, namely, to dismantle Germany in a military way and destroy whatever materials she may have already on hand that can be turned in that direction. If, then, Germany refuses or fails to perform the terms which we have imposed upon her and begins again the establishment or creation of her military system, and begins again to manufacture guns and to train armies and to construct vessels, and if Great Britain and France can not prevent that infraction of her agreement with us, I am willing to go again and complete the undertaking upon which we formerly entered.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. KING. Is not the argument which the Senator has just made, namely, that Germany should be prevented again from embarking upon a military career, because if she did it would

be a menace to our country, an argument in favor of some sort of agreement or league of nations, by whatever name you want to call it, with the allied Governments with whom we have been associated, by which the guaranties that shall be exacted from Germany shall be carried out, and she shall be prevented in the future from becoming again an enemy to civilization and to the world?

Mr. CUMMINS. That is precisely what I said. I regard that not as a new obligation which we should assume; that is our obligation now without any league of nations, without any further alliance than we have.

What I have said, I think, is in exact harmony with the suggestion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. I am not saying that the peace conference should not set up these sovereignties; I hope that they will be given free rein, in order that each of these races, with such modifications as may be necessary, may be given independence; I want to see that happen; but it seems to me that the wise course, so far as Germany is concerned, is to say to her, "We lay no obstacle in your way for commercial development." Indeed, we ought to foster that, for if we are to receive reparation, if Germany is to pay for the infinite destruction which she has caused in the world, the German people must earn the money with which to pay it; Germany must earn what becomes necessary to repair Belgium, to restore France, to indemnify Great Britain, and to reimburse the United States—for I think that ought to be one of the terms—but in order to earn that money Germany must be permitted her commercial activities. Otherwise it would be simply a brutum fulmen to say that she shall pay if we do not give her an opportunity to earn the money with which to pay.

However, so far as Germany's military establishment is concerned, I would destroy it. Whatever may be necessary to enforce internal peace—that is, the peace of municipalities and the like—she ought to be permitted to preserve; but in so far as her military establishment, that could or would be used in a world war, or in a war on any other nation, she ought to have none. That ought to be the penalty which shall be imposed upon her for her wickedness and malice in beginning and carrying on this most destructive war of the ages. If Germany at any time is found to be disobeying the terms which we impose upon her in that respect, then it would become the duty, first, of Great Britain and France, because of their proximity, and, next, of the United States, to whip her again, and see that she does not establish that military strength.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. What does the Senator from Iowa propose to do with Germany's navy?

Mr. CUMMINS. I go no further in that problem than to say that it should not belong to Germany. The Senator from Tennessee can do anything he pleases with it if it is not permitted to remain the instrument of German destruction.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree entirely with the Senator from Iowa. I do not want to do anything with it except to keep Germany from using it against civilization.

Mr. CUMMINS. All I insist upon is that Germany shall be left helpless and harmless for the years to come.

Mr. President, believing that these are the principles that should be observed in making peace with Germany, and that these are the principles that ought to be enforced with regard to the new nations that are to be established in eastern and southern Europe, I find no other conclusion possible than to oppose the appropriation which is intended to commit the United States, not only to the establishment but to the guardianship, the protection, and the defense of every country in Europe for all time to come.

Mr. CALDER obtained the floor.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York permit me to interrupt him for just a moment, as I have to attend a meeting of the conference committee on the revenue bill?

Mr. CALDER. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. I hold in my hand a telegram from C. H. Canby, who, I am informed, was formerly president of the Board of Trade of Chicago, and is one of the leading grain dealers in that city, a man of high standing and wide experience as to the food situation here and abroad. His telegram reads:

CHICAGO, ILL., January 22, 1919.

HOB. BOIES PENROSE.
Washington, D. C.:

Rumors are current that the Food Administration has already expended over \$20,000,000 of the expected appropriation without authority of law. This situation should be investigated to determine if there is any truth in the report.

C. H. CANBY.

I do not know whether there is any Senator on the floor at the present time having charge of the pending bill in the absence of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN]—

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

Mr. PENROSE. Has the Senator from Tennessee the bill in charge?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not the bill in charge. I am merely representing the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. PENROSE. Then I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee whether or not such rumor has been called to his attention or whether he knows anything about the matter?

Mr. McKELLAR. The reading of the telegram by the Senator from Pennsylvania was the first intimation I had of it.

Mr. PENROSE. In view of the fact that this telegram comes from a gentleman of the highest responsibility and a leader in the food situation in Chicago, nationally and internationally, I should be glad if the Senator from Tennessee and the chairman of the committee would take occasion to look into the matter; and I will call their attention to it later on.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will call the attention of the chairman of the committee to it as soon as he returns to the Chamber.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, the debate on this bill has assumed a wide range, and I think it is well that it has, for I believe as a result of this discussion Senators have come to understand some facts with which they were unfamiliar.

The people of this country during the war raised for the Red Cross and other organizations engaged in like work sums totaling nearly \$1,000,000,000. This money was spent in the camps in this country and Europe for the benefit of our soldiers and our allies, and to a very great extent to relieve the condition of the people living in the countries associated with us in the war. The American people gave freely to these funds, and my information is that when the armistice was signed great quantities of food were stored in the warehouses of Europe under the control of the Red Cross. I assume, of course, that this food is being used to relieve the hunger of the people of the countries really in need.

From the very beginning of the war England, France, and Italy, and the neutral countries of Europe had located in this country commissions authorized to purchase and forward food to them. These commissions in their work here were associated with the United States Food Administrator, Mr. Hoover. We dealt liberally with these people. Everything was done to give them as much food as we could spare, and at the lowest price under the circumstances. England, I am told, as a result of this liberal attitude on the part of the United States, at the close of the war had stored in her warehouses a food supply for her people and her army that would have lasted four months. France, although not as well supplied, had a large surplus on hand. Much of this was brought about through the willingness of the American people during the year 1918 to give up much of the food to which they had been accustomed. I am told also that the record shows the consumption of wheat in the United States in 1918 was over 100,000,000 bushels less than in the previous year and that the quantity of sugar consumed in this country was much less than the previous year, and, further, in the curtailment of every single food product the American people willingly responded.

During all of this period we were building up a great surplus stock. The splendid crops of last year, exceeding by far the crops of 1917, added much to the surplus. In fact, the failure to realize the extent of this increase and the insistence upon curtailment on consumption gave us a surplus out of all proportion to the needs of either our allies or ourselves for the year 1919. Naturally, with the high prices prevailing, production was encouraged in every line, and when the end of the war came we had in the storehouses of America a supply of food far beyond the anticipations of anyone.

We find ourselves now, with the war over and the stoppage of the flow of foodstuffs to Europe, in a condition where, if things were normal and the Government had not taken over the fixing of the prices of food, the people of this country would be able to buy the necessities of life at nearly one-half of what they are to-day.

Europe has stopped buying from us because they can buy cheaper from other places. I am informed that Argentine wheat can be bought to-day for \$1.29 per bushel and that there are over 160,000,000 bushels stored in that country. Australian wheat can be bought for \$1.14 per bushel, and there are 200,000,000 bushels available, while 80,000,000 additional bushels can be had in India. As against these prices, American wheat at \$2.26, primary market, with freight and terminal charges added, bringing it nearer \$2.45, will have no market abroad.

Corn in Chicago sells for \$1.23 per bushel, while the Argentine corn can be purchased for half that figure. The same holds good for oats, rye, and other products of the farm. The other day I received the astonishing information that in the city of New York alone there were in the neighborhood of 750,000 barrels of flour in the storehouses, and that this enormous supply was so alarming to the flour merchants of the city that they were offering it at a price lower than was agreed upon with the Food Administrator. These figures, of course, are staggering when one comes to consider the price of food to the consumer.

In connection with hogs, it is of interest to note that the 40 principal packing companies joined in sending a letter to the Food Administration last October, in which they expressed the opinion that the proposed basis of stabilizing the price of hogs would result in unduly high prices to the consumer. This letter appears in the Official Bulletin of October 7, and I quote from it as follows:

This plan may result in the warehouses being filled up with high-priced products. We feel that the establishing of the basis suggested may result in higher prices to the consumer.

The situation now is that hogs are being offered to the packers at less than the guaranteed price of \$17.50 per hundred-weight. The packers, however, being completely under the domination of the Food Administration, do not dare buy at any lower prices.

Yesterday's Washington Post contained a report of Tuesday's grain market in Chicago. This shows that the rumor that the Food Administration is to maintain the present artificial high price of hogs resulted in an increase of 3 cents a bushel in the price of corn.

The Food Administration formed a corporation under the laws of the State of Delaware, known as the "Sugar Equalization Board." This board bought the entire crop of Cuban cane sugar. The producers there were given to understand that no other purchasers except the board would be able to secure transportation facilities. The board pays the sugar producers 5.50 cents f. o. b. Cuba. This makes the cost of sugar 6.90 cents, duty paid and delivered to the refineries along the Atlantic coast.

Here comes the "nigger in the woodpile." The board, instead of selling to the refineries at this price of 6.90 cents, charges them 7.28 cents a pound for this sugar, thus giving the board a clear profit of 0.38 cent a pound on each pound of raw sugar brought into the country and increasing the price to the consumer by just this amount. If this procedure is continued, the board will make a clear profit this season of about \$30,000,000, which, in reality, is a consumption tax on the American public.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATSON in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CALDER. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know whether the Senator is aware of the reason for that difference of 38 cents a hundred, and if he has no objection I will briefly state it at this time.

Mr. CALDER. I have no objection to the Senator doing so.

Mr. SMOOT. Last year, Mr. President, it became quite evident that there would be a shortage of sugar in all the world, and in order to induce the beet growers of the West and the sugar-cane growers of the South to plant additional acreage for the production of sugar, the price of beets was advanced to \$10 a ton. Mr. Hoover and the people interested knew that they could not get the tonnage without that increase, particularly after the price of wheat had been fixed as high as it had been.

There was an agreement reached with Cuban producers of sugar that they should be paid \$6.50 for their sugar, and the 38 cents difference, I will say to the Senator, between the cost and the freight of Cuban sugar and the amount for which it is sold to the refiner goes to make up the loss on the sales of sugar produced from \$10 beets; in other words, it was equalized by the 38-cent profit made upon the Cuban sugar in order that the Food Administration could take care of the loss of about 60 cents a hundred on beet sugar, thus making the price of sugar uniform throughout the United States, whether produced from beets or produced in Cuba. I simply wanted to say to the Senator that that is how that difference comes about.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator from Utah if he has any information as to the disposition to be made of this profit by the board?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I hardly think there will be any profit on the whole transaction. The Food Administration purchased all the beet sugar, and the loss on the same is 60 cents a hundred, as I remember now. That applies also to the cane

sugar of the South. The 38 cents profit on the Cuban sugar offsets the loss of 60 cents on American-produced sugar in this way: There is more Cuban sugar consumed in the United States than there is sugar produced in this country, and if the Senator will figure out the amount of Cuban sugar consumed and the amount of beet sugar and cane sugar produced and consumed in this country he will find that the profit of 38 cents a hundred on Cuban sugar will just about offset the loss of 60 cents a hundred on the sugar produced in this country.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President—

Mr. CALDER. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah a question while he is on that subject. Can the Senator inform me as to what profits were allowed the beet-sugar manufacturers, and how those profits compared with the profits which they had hitherto been making?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the profits allowed to the sugar producers of the West were very greatly reduced in the year 1918 below what they had been in 1917. In other words, during 1917 the price of the beets purchased by the beet-sugar manufacturers ran all the way from \$6.50 up to \$8 per ton, and they sold the sugar for higher prices during that year than they sold the sugar for during 1918. The sugar made in 1918 was made from \$10 beets, so that really the profits of the beet-sugar companies in 1918 were nothing as compared with their profits in 1917.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, nor is this all. The Sugar Equalization Board have presented contracts to all the sugar refineries, the terms of which specify that the refineries will not purchase any raw sugar except from the board up to December 31, 1919. A very eminent lawyer in New York, Mr. William D. Guthrie, has advised his clients, the Federal Sugar Refining Co., that this contract is clearly illegal and in violation of the antitrust laws. I attach herewith Mr. Guthrie's opinion, which was published in the Journal of Commerce on December 24 last, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SUGAR CONTRACT CALLED ILLEGAL.—WILLIAM D. GUTHRIE WARNS AGAINST PROPOSAL.—OPINION IS FURNISHED AT THE REQUEST OF FEDERAL SUGAR REFINING CO.—CONTRACT IN QUESTION WOULD GOVERN TRADE FOR 1919.

In the opinion of William D. Guthrie, of Guthrie, Bangs & Van Sinderen, 44 Wall Street, the proposed new contract between the United States Food Administration and the sugar-refining industry would be held invalid by the courts. Mr. Guthrie believes that the creation of the United States Sugar Equalization Board (Inc.), a Delaware corporation, as the instrumentality of the Food Administration for the carrying out of the contract is "plainly illegal," and that other features of the proposed contract are of "doubtful legality." The signing of the armistice, it is held, has radically changed the situation.

The opinion of Mr. Guthrie was sought by the Federal Sugar Refining Co. The proposed contract is dated October 24, 1918, and is to remain in force until December 31, 1919. It provides, among other things, that until December 31, 1919, the refiners will not purchase any sugar except from the Delaware corporation, other than such sugars as are provided under the agreement of October 1, 1917, and Hawaiian sugars, and that the Delaware corporation "may earn a profit on any sugar it may purchase and resell to refiners, or any sugar it may purchase from refiners and resell for export."

TEST OF OPINION.

In part, Mr. Guthrie's view reads as follows:

"I am of opinion that the proposed agreement above mentioned, to be entered into by the American refiners and dated October 24, 1918, would be held invalid by the courts on the ground that it was beyond any power vested in the United States Food Administrator or any other officer of the United States Government, and that it would so held illegal on the ground that it constituted a violation of the prohibitions of the acts of Congress commonly known as the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Clayton Act, approved, respectively, July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as well as of the act of August 10, 1917, itself.

"I am also of the opinion that the proposed agreement would imply and create an obligation on the part of each refiner signatory to buy from the Delaware corporation an amount of raw sugar approximately commensurate with the normal requirements of the refiner's business notwithstanding the provision above quoted from article 6 of the agreement, to the effect that several refiners are 'not in any way limiting their ordinary power or business discretion to determine to what extent they may severally operate their refineries.'"

EFFECT OF ARMISTICE.

"I do not question the patriotic and humanitarian motives which have actuated the Food Administrator and his representatives during the crisis of the war. The conditions existing in October, 1917, may have justified extra-legal methods, to which patriotic refiners were readily willing to accede. But conditions have meantime materially changed. The President—advisedly, as we must assume—declared to the Congress on November 11, 1918, in stating the terms of the armistice, that the war thus comes to an end; for, having accepted these terms of armistice, it would be impossible for the German command to renew it.

"In the light of this official pronouncement by the President, it certainly behooves all Government officers carefully to consult the legal source of their authority and to bear in mind that their powers are limited by the statute, that they can not go beyond its limits, and that no emergency, however grave, can of itself create any source of power. It likewise behooves Government officers now to reflect upon the very questionable propriety of attempting to coerce acquiescence in extra-legal acts by undue pressure or by threats to withdraw licenses or otherwise, however patriotic or benevolent their motives may be.

"I should add that in my opinion section 2 of the act of August 10, 1917, does not empower the President, or the Food Administrator, or any other officer of the Government to organize a corporation under the laws of a State, such as the United States Sugar Equalization Board (Inc.), to act "as an agency of the United States for the purpose in part of equalizing the distribution and selling price of sugar.

IMPOSE A CONSUMPTION TAX.

"The creation by the Food Administrator of a State corporation to be availed of as an alleged instrumentality of the Federal Government, the engaging by him in the business of buying and selling sugar (if in fact it be not speculating in sugar), and the disregard of the letter and spirit of sections 4 and 9 of the act of Congress of 1917, are in my opinion plainly illegal, and other features of the proposed agreement are of doubtful legality. The Delaware corporation may be, and presumably will be, operated for profit, but no such agency of the United States has been authorized by statute with power to risk the funds of the United States or to collect or extort a profit from the people out of the distribution of a food product. Under this plan the Food Administrator could in practical effect impose a consumption tax. This is not a legitimate method of effectuating any power so far delegated to the President or the Food Administrator, and certainly it is not warranted by the act of 1917.

RESTRAINT OF TRADE.

"The agreement in its provisions, its intent, and its purpose would, in my opinion, be held by the courts to be beyond the power of the Food Administration and invalid, and hence not binding upon or enforceable against any of its parties, and least of all binding upon or enforceable against the Food Administrator. No officer of the Government can reasonably or properly be said to act under color of a law which neither gives him nor any other person authority to do the acts in question.

"The proposed agreement, in my opinion, is a combination in restraint of foreign and interstate trade and commerce, and as such clearly violative of the provisions of the several acts of Congress above referred to, namely, the Sherman Antitrust Act, the Clayton Act, and the act of August 10, 1917. This proposition seems to me to be plain and indisputable, and particularly so in view of the provisions of sections 4 and 9 of the last-named act.

WOULD BE NO DEFENSE.

"The Food Administrator, if he entered into the proposed agreement, would be acting not as an officer of the Government but individually as a self-constituted trustee and guardian of the sugar trade, and his official character and patriotic motives would be no defense even to him if indicted or sued for a violation of the several acts of Congress. Nor would it afford any defense to the American refiners to plead that they had entered into such a combination or agreement from patriotic motives at the urgent request and pressure of the Food Administrator or of the President or were coerced thereto by an official threat of having their business ruined by the withdrawal or cancellation of their licenses. Moreover, it should be recalled that any third person injured in his business or property by the operation of the proposed combination could sue any of the parties thereto and recover threefold damages, as prescribed in section 7 of the Sherman Act. That this might constitute a very serious risk can not be doubted."

Mr. CALDER. Nor is this all. During the war there have been tremendous accumulations of raw sugar in Java, which next to Cuba is the largest producer. Authorities in the trade state that this sugar can now be laid down in New York at about 2 cents a pound under the price at which the Sugar Equalization Board is selling to refineries. This Java sugar, however, can not be brought into this country because the Sugar Equalization Board, in protecting its "corner," has the active cooperation of the War Trade Board. The latter made the public announcement on January 14, as follows:

The War Trade Board announces that hereafter licenses for the importation of sugar will be issued only to the Sugar Equalization Board (Inc.) or its nominees.

We thus see that the Food Administration, acting through its creature, the Sugar Equalization Board (Inc.), has established a "corner" on imported cane sugar; it is levying a tribute of about three-eighths of a cent per pound on every pound of raw sugar; and it is protected in its "corner" by the War Trade Board.

Owing to the importance of tin plate in the manufacture of containers for foodstuffs, the situation in tin is worth noting. Tin is selling in London at about 55 cents a pound. It should be selling here for only a few cents more; as a matter of fact, through the operation of the War Industries Board and of the War Trade Board, tin can not be purchased in this country under 72½ cents per pound. The reason is that the War Industries Board contracted for an enormous supply of tin when prices were at their highest. This tin is now coming into the country and is being offered to the trade at 72½ cents per pound. In order to protect this Government speculation in tin, the War Trade Board will not issue licenses to any private individuals or companies to bring tin into the country, and consumers instead of buying their tin under 60 cents a pound must pay 72½ cents. Here again is an example of the results brought about by clumsy attempts on the part of Government agencies to set aside the laws of supply and demand.

I saw in the newspapers the other day a statement attributed to an officer of the Quartermaster Department appearing before a committee of the House of Representatives, in which he insisted that his department would require a 10 per cent increase in their allowance for food for the Army on the theory that when the Food Administrator ceased to fix the price of food products they would rise at least 10 per cent. This appears to

me to be absurd, because with the enormous quantity of food here in this country, and with England and France buying from Argentina and Australia at a price 40 per cent less than we can sell them, there can be but one result, and that is cheaper food for the American people.

My attention has been called, Mr. President, to a statement published in the New York Sun of last Sunday, which shows the extent to which the food supply has been increased in this country compared with a year ago. I quote from that statement as follows:

FIGURES SHOW BIG INCREASE.

Statistics from sources that can not be disputed show that on January 1, 1919, there was an increase of 389,221,075 pounds over January 1, 1918, in storage, of frozen-beef stocks, cured beef, frozen lamb and mutton, frozen pork, dry salt pork, pickled pork, lard, and miscellaneous meats. In the face of these staggering stores many who dispute the wisdom of a continuance of governmental price fixing on hogs with bacon retailing at 60 cents per pound say they can not see any necessity for the present high prices ruling for pork.

The comparative figures of these stocks in pounds tell their own story:

	FROZEN BEEF.	Pounds.
Jan. 1, 1919	295,206,748	
Jan. 1, 1918	274,073,518	
Increase of	21,133,230	
Plus holdings not reported	1,240,615	
Total increase	22,382,845	
	CURED BEEF.	Pounds.
Jan. 1, 1919	35,601,588	
Jan. 1, 1918	33,077,346	
Increase of	2,524,242	
Not reported	564,754	
Total increase	3,088,996	
	FROZEN LAMB AND MUTTON.	Pounds.
Jan. 1, 1919	12,254,508	
Jan. 1, 1918	6,219,298	
Increase of	6,035,210	
Not reported	190,410	
Total increase	6,225,620	
	FROZEN PORK.	Pounds.
January 1, 1919	59,854,765	
January 1, 1918	30,192,103	
Increase of	29,662,662	
Not reported	2,220,301	
Total increase	31,882,963	
	DRY SALT PORK.	Pounds.
January 1, 1919	350,884,441	
January 1, 1918	234,055,592	
Increase of	116,828,849	
Not reported	2,963,940	
Total increase	119,792,789	
	PICKLED PORK.	Pounds.
January 1, 1919	289,409,761	
January 1, 1918	242,295,401	
Increase of	56,114,360	
Not reported	3,964,066	
Total increase	60,079,266	
	LARD.	Pounds.
January 1, 1919	100,755,440	
January 1, 1918	51,873,806	
Increase of	48,881,634	
Not reported	3,209,894	
Total increase	52,091,528	
	MISCELLANEOUS MEATS.	Pounds.
January 1, 1919	127,942,489	
January 1, 1918	34,965,952	
Increase of	92,976,537	
Not reported	700,531	
Total increase	93,677,068	

These figures indicate that there were on January 1, 1919, 389,221,000 pounds of frozen beef, lamb, and pork in storage over January 1, 1918. An analysis of these figures will show that the quantity of these food products in refrigerators in this country will amount to the enormous sum of 1,200,000,000 pounds. What shall we do with such a surplus and the demand on the part of the people for cheaper food? The President has fixed the price of wheat at \$2.26 for the farmer in 1919, and the Food Administrator has fixed the price of many other products by regulation. In a few days the Food Administrator's department will determine again just what price will

be placed on some of these commodities for this year. The people of this country will not be willing to continue to pay 75 cents a pound for butter, 45 cents for ham and bacon, 50 cents for beef, 40 to 50 cents for lamb, and \$12 a barrel for flour when they know that the country is filled with enormous supplies of these products.

The other day I read in the newspapers, and it was stated on the floor of the Senate, that we will be asked to appropriate a large sum of money, even as high as \$1,000,000,000, to make up the difference this year between the guaranteed price of wheat to the farmer and the normal price in the world's market. Mr. President, there are just two ways to determine this matter, in my opinion, either to repeal that provision of the Food Administration act giving the President the power to fix the price of wheat or else appropriate the necessary amount, so that the country may be able to obtain food at fair prices.

It is obvious that unless the regulations of the Food Administrator and the War Trade Board are entirely abrogated, prices of necessities in this country—and therefore the prices of all commodities—will remain close to their present high levels. Among other effects of this artificial condition is that this country will be the worst market for foreigners to buy in and the best for them to sell in; result, a rapid disappearance of the favorable balance of trade which this country had enjoyed the last few years.

This whole question of high prices of food goes with the prices paid for everything else. The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] stated the other day that if we hoped to readjust prices the wage of the workingman must also be readjusted. I concur with him in that statement; but I do insist, Mr. President, that the workingman of the country is not asking any more for what he has to sell than his employer, who is also getting his full share of the profits. The slightest inquiry will develop the fact that while the workingman's pay has been increased materially during the war, it has not been increased out of proportion to the things he is compelled to buy.

If we insist that the price of wheat is to be maintained during the coming year, and with it the price of other food products, then, indeed, it will be difficult for us to insist on the readjustment of the workingman's pay. On the other hand, if we reduce the price of the products raised by the farmer, he has a right to demand that the things he has to purchase be likewise reduced in cost.

Senators have arisen in their places here to denounce combinations of capital and to criticize the business man, and I believe the criticism is just in some cases, for many men have taken advantage of the war emergency to raise prices out of all proportion to the needs of their business. And let me here, today, warn these men that unless there is a disposition here and now on the part of everyone to make some sacrifice in the interest of all concerned, then the whole business fabric will come toppling over our heads. If all are willing to help, then business catastrophe may be averted. If not, who can tell what the future may have in store?

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hardwick	Martin, Va.	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Henderson	Moses	Smoot
Beckham	Hitchcock	Myers	Sterling
Borah	Johnson, Cal.	New	Swanson
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nugent	Thomas
Coit	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Thompson
Culberson	Kellogg	Page	Townsend
Cummins	Kenyon	Penrose	Trammell
Curtis	King	Phelan	Underwood
Fletcher	Knox	Polindexter	Wadsworth
France	La Follette	Pollock	Walsh
Frelinghuysen	Lewis	Pomerene	Watson
Gay	McCumber	Ransdell	Weeks
Gore	McKellar	Saulsbury	Williams
Gronna	McLean	Shafroth	
Hale	McNary	Sheppard	
Harding	Martin, Ky.	Sherman	

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Wolcott] is absent on official business.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the absence of the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] on account of illness in his family. This announcement may stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. *Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, never in my service have I been undecided as to what was the best thing for me to do until the pending measure was under consideration by the Appropriations Committee.

I have served in the Senate now for nearly 16 years. I never had a pair during that whole time. I never have dodged a vote in any way. I always have had my mind clearly made up on every proposition that has been presented to the Senate of the United States during that term of service. My conscience has been perfectly clear in regard to every vote I have ever cast; but I want frankly to admit now that I am not so clear in my mind as to what is the best thing to do, whether to vote for or against this measure. I have been trying to definitely decide from reading the testimony submitted in favor of it and the remarks made. I know this: I would prefer to make a mistake, if I do make a mistake, in upholding the representatives of our Government now seeking terms of peace in Europe than to make a mistake upon the other side.

Mr. President, I can not believe that before Mr. Hoover left the United States for Europe he had a complete understanding of what he was to do when he reached there, or that he had any understanding whatever with the supreme council of supply and relief or with the allied war council as to what should be done by way of relief for the suffering countries of the Old World. I do not believe I reveal any secret when I say that the day before Mr. Hoover sailed for Europe he asked the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to call a meeting of the members of that committee—and I might add that there were a few other Senators present who were not members of the committee—and at that meeting he stated that he intended to leave for Europe the next day, and he felt that it was his duty to tell the members of the committee the object of his mission. He stated that he had been asked by the President of the United States to go to Europe for the purpose of assisting the allied countries in the distribution of the necessities of life to the starving people of Europe. Mr. Hoover did not go into details as to why that should be done, but he said that it was absolutely necessary that it should be done if the lives of millions of people were to be saved.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, do we understand that before Mr. Hoover left here, and before he had made any investigation of his own, he had already determined that this must be done?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I know that Mr. Hoover had made an examination before he left here, by representatives of the Food Administration.

Mr. BORAH. I know; but I ask the Senator now whether I am to understand that before Mr. Hoover arrived in Europe he told the committee that he was determined upon this program of feeding Europe?

Mr. SMOOT. I would not go so far as to say "feeding Europe." I will say that Mr. Hoover stated to the committee that he had men in every country of Europe, and that he had reports from those men showing the necessity of early assistance to the starving people of those countries.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask if he stated when he had sent those men to Europe, and under what authority?

Mr. SMOOT. He did not tell the committee when he sent them, but I do know that he has had them there for some time. There is no doubt at all about it and no secret about it.

Mr. BORAH. Under what authority did Mr. Hoover send men to Europe, prior to the signing of the armistice, to investigate the conditions?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should suppose that he acted upon the power that was granted to him by Congress in the food act. I do not think that that act limits his power to controlling the food situation in this country alone; and not only that, but I wish to say to the Senate that the food that has been shipped to the different countries of Europe has been purchased by Mr. Hoover. The allied countries have given him the power to purchase the wheat, to purchase the foodstuffs of all kinds for England, France, Italy, and other countries as well.

Mr. BORAH. I know that, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. And I suppose it is through that power that he has exercised the right of sending men into Europe for investigating the food conditions.

Mr. Hoover stated to the committee that he had no idea how much money would be required, if any at all; but he did suggest that more than likely he would require a revolving fund of twenty-five or thirty million dollars, and I think the chairman of the committee—and if I am wrong I want him to correct me—said to Mr. Hoover, "If it becomes absolutely necessary for you to have the money you no doubt will cable or write to the chairman of this committee."

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Senator is absolutely correct about that.

Mr. SMOOT. At that time there was no understanding as to how much money it would take. He had not met the allied council of supply and relief. No conferences had been held between him and representatives of the other countries. After he arrived there those meetings were held and counsel taken, and it was decided then by this supreme council of supply and relief that it would take a minimum of \$300,000,000 to relieve the sufferings of the peoples that were in dire distress.

Mr. President, as to whether or not \$300,000,000 will be sufficient, I do not know, and I do not believe Mr. Hoover knows; but the supreme council has come to the conclusion that it will take at least that amount, and of that amount the President of the United States and Mr. Hoover agree that America should furnish \$100,000,000, England and France and Italy to furnish the other \$200,000,000, making a revolving fund of \$300,000,000. The bill specifically states that it shall be a revolving fund, and I want to state frankly that the evidence that was submitted to the committee went to show that the greater part of the money advanced would be returned, and that it was only a charity in so far as it advanced money to the people who were starving, and charitable in the sense that it saved them from a pending danger, and that they were to pay the amount advanced back to those advancing the money.

Mr. President, I have no doubt but that some of this money is going to be returned to the Treasury of the United States. In fact, I am positive of it. I believe that every dollar of it that is furnished to the people of the northern part of France and Belgium will be returned. I believe that all of it will be repaid that is advanced to people where there is a semblance of government or a government that has been recognized by the allied powers and the United States. I know, however, that millions of dollars of this appropriation will go to people that are living to-day under no form of government recognized by the allied powers or by our Government, and I doubt whether a cent of such advance will ever be returned to the Treasury of the United States. When this bill passes, if it does pass and become a law, and the money is expended for that purpose, I know that it will be impossible for all of it to be returned. As I stated this morning, if we receive back 50 per cent of it, that is all that I shall expect, and more, too. If I vote for the bill, it will be with the distinct understanding that as to the major portion of this appropriation it is in fact a charity.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHAFROTH in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator spoke of northern France. Does the Senator think that France is now in need of financial relief from the United States to feed its own people?

Mr. SMOOT. I think there are a great many people in northern France that have to be fed; and I was going to say to the Senator that under the arrangement that is made it could hardly be called a case of the United States feeding France, because a part of the \$300,000,000 comes from the revenues of France.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] objects seriously to the distribution of this appropriation in the way provided, as far as the United States is concerned, and thought that it ought to be distributed as a direct gift of the specific items of food that we intend to furnish and not in the form of the fund provided for.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator spoke just a moment ago about getting back that portion of this fund that will be expended to feed people in northern France. The showing here is that France is contributing money to feed the rest of Europe. France has suffered more than any of the allies in this war, because she has borne the brunt of the war; but France is great in the organization and reorganization of peace, as she was great in war, and is fully able to take care of her own people, and is taking care of them, and taking care of the people in other parts of Europe. She is not asking for charity from the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, so far as northern France is concerned, I do not consider that it is charity, and have so stated; but as to the great part of France that was overrun by the hordes of the Hun, whose cities were destroyed by the hundred, where there is not one stone left standing upon another and every vestige of life is completely destroyed, when those people go to their homes you can not tell me that they are not in dire distress and that they do not need assistance from every source possible.

Mr. President, the only way this can be done properly is to have it done in the way that this bill provides or that the

program as mapped out provides, and that is that the money given by each one of the allied countries shall be put into one fund, and wherever goods are purchased, no matter from what part of the world they are purchased, they are to be paid for out of this fund, and when part of the money is returned it is to go into the fund, and when the final conclusion of this undertaking is reached whatever is collected from those that have been assisted will be distributed and paid back in exactly the same proportion that it was paid into the fund.

This is the only logical way that it could be done. It can not be done by England buying a cargo of wheat or of flour and distributing it to the needy somewhere and America sending over her meat products or a cargo of wheat and having that distributed somewhere, and then future payments made for those items thus distributed returned to the country furnishing each article. I say that the only way to do it is to do it in the way that is provided for in the pending bill if we are going to do it at all.

This proposition comes unexpectedly to the American people. The war having virtually ceased, or at least an armistice having been signed, and everyone in all the world believing that the war was at an end, the American people believed that with all the charity that they had extended in the past the calls for foreign assistance made upon them were at an end; but, Mr. President, from those who are upon the ground, those who ought to know, there comes this demand for additional assistance—I may say, in the last hour of the great conflict. When we contemplate the wonderful response that the American people have made to every call on them; when we know and realize the hundreds of millions and billions of dollars that the people have given gladly to carry on this great world conflict and bring it to a successful conclusion; when we know that every State in the Union has not only answered the call of the Government upon every occasion but more than done so; and when now perhaps the last call is made, and the call is for the purpose of saving the starving people of Europe, not brought about by any act of theirs, I want to say to the Senators that if there had been appeals made to the American people that a gift be made for this amount, or a direct donation, I have not a doubt but what it would have been granted.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. Not for the purpose of controverting any statements made by the Senator from Utah, but simply for information, I wish to ask him as to this fund for which he speaks. If I understood him correctly, France is to contribute a third, England a third, and the United States the other third. I wish to understand if it is to be used for the purchase of food to be distributed in France or England?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think any of it is to be distributed in England. I think some of it is going to be distributed in northern France. As I have already stated, most of it will go to Belgians, Poles, Ukrainians, and Serbians—people who have virtually lost everything they had on earth and have not a thing to live on.

Mr. GRONNA. Of course, that would be outside of France. If the people of France can contribute \$100,000,000 to this fund, what is the necessity for us to contribute? I am not saying now that I am opposed to it, but I ask simply for information. If the people of France are able to contribute \$100,000,000, or one-third of the fund, what is the necessity for the United States to contribute, if it is for their use only? Is there any reason to suppose that the fund is to be distributed exclusively outside of the countries which have been named?

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say, as I said before, the program was mapped out by the supreme council of supply and relief and supported by the allied war council, and that program is to take care of the suffering people wherever they may be.

Mr. GRONNA. Of Europe?

Mr. SMOOT. Of Europe. I mentioned the northern part of France, because I have no doubt but what they will require relief, and as long as relief is the program, why say to France that she shall take care of her own sufferers separately from the program of taking care of the peoples of Europe who are suffering?

Mr. GRONNA. I am finding no fault with that. The Senator is a member of the committee having this bill in charge, and it is reasonable to suppose that he can give the Senate some information as to the desire of the commission as to where the food shall go. I should like to know if it was understood by the committee that this mission has asked for this fund that it might be used for the purpose of purchasing food not only for friendly nations, those who have been our friends in this struggle, but also to be used and distributed in those countries that have been our enemies in the war?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that that could not be done under the provisions of the bill. The bill specifically states that it shall not be used for feeding the people of countries that were the enemies of the United States.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator evidently did not understand my question. I simply wanted to know what the committee understands. I have read the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what the committee understands.

Mr. GRONNA. That it shall be used just for people of the allied nations or of the friendly nations?

Mr. SMOOT. For people of the friendly nations of the world.

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator will permit me in his time, I will say to him that we had before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry during this week a gentleman who stated under oath that he sat in all the conferences with this commission, as you may call it, and he named the men, and that Mr. Hoover, Mr. Hurley, the representative of Great Britain, Lord Reading, the representative of France, M. Clementel, agreed that it should be used not only for the allied nations or the friendly nations but for the enemy nations. That is why I asked the Senator the question I did.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows that under the provisions of the bill it could not be used for that purpose. I wish to say to the Senator that the man who testified that way may have gotten mixed as to whether it was this fund or whether it was Mr. Hurley's proposition of selling to Germany and Austria some \$70,000,000 worth of food products in return for certain shipping and products that they have for disposal.

Mr. GRONNA. Will the Senator permit me to answer that?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not say that that is the case; I simply say it may have been.

Mr. GRONNA. I think in justice to the man whom I have quoted, I should also state that he said it was understood by this commission that the entire fund should be used for the purchase of food sold for cash.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course that could not possibly be true. I will say to the Senator that I know Mr. Hoover did not think so when he left, because if the Senator was here when I made the statement of Mr. Hoover's appearance before the Committee on Appropriations he will remember that Mr. Hoover then did not make any such proposition. That was before he went to Europe.

Mr. GRONNA. This witness stated that that was the understanding not only of Mr. Hoover but of this commission.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that if it was the understanding at any time it was not the understanding the day before Mr. Hoover went to Europe.

Mr. GRONNA. Let me not be misunderstood. This witness has seen Mr. Hoover later than the committee has seen him. This was after the Senator from Utah and the committee had seen Mr. Hoover.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course I can not say from personal knowledge what happened in Europe, other than what appears in the cablegrams; but I say I know that no part of the \$100,000,000 can be used for the relief of the enemy countries of the United States under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, I know the time has got to come, and that soon, when Congress must cease appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars. I thought it had arrived before this bill came before the Committee on Appropriations; but, Mr. President, this appropriation of \$100,000,000 is asked for at a time when the representatives of our country are undertaking to reach a peace agreement; they say it is absolutely necessary that this shall be done; and I, as an American citizen, feel that I dare not take the responsibility of saying that it shall not be done.

I know that in the years to come taxes will be burdensome upon the American people. That time will be here not only this year, next year, and the next, but I say that my grandchildren will be paying heavy taxes on the obligations incurred by the Government of the United States for participation in the present world war. Rather would I begin with every appropriation bill that comes to the Senate at this session and eliminate from it every dollar that is not absolutely necessary than to make a mistake in defeating this bill. Mr. President, if mistakes are made in an annual appropriation bill they can be rectified within a few months. Such mistakes can not involve the future peace of our Government, but the pending appropriation may have such an effect. If this appropriation is to be made at all, it ought to be made at once. If the money is to be used at all, it ought to be used now. People can not go month in and month out with nothing to eat. If we are going to save the lives of suffering hundreds of thousands and perhaps millions of people, the quicker we do it the better.

I do not know whether it is worth while, Mr. President, to call attention to other matters that have been referred to during this discussion, because it seemed to me they were foreign to the subject. I have no doubt it would be just at this time to say the criticisms of the packers in some respects are unjust. I have no defense to make for them whenever they do aught that is contrary to the rules of honesty and justice, but I say now in justice to them that if they had not been organized as they were at the outbreak of war our American boys would never have been fed as they have been. In justification also of Mr. Hoover, he made his contracts not only with the producers of pork, in which the packers were compelled to pay 17½ cents per pound live weight, but he compelled the packers to buy the same and then limited the profits which they could make upon any sale to an amount not to exceed 2½ per cent. I claim now there is not another class of business in all the world whose sales charges are as low as 2½ per cent. If we want to save the consumers of this country money and bring down the cost of living, let us go to the places where they are not charging 2½ per cent, but in many cases 100 or 125 per cent on many sales. I say there is not a retail store in the District of Columbia which sells at a profit of less than 20 per cent on sales, and it runs all the way from 20 per cent up.

I know it sounds big to say that Armour & Co. made \$15,000,000 last year, but do you know why they made it? Their sales were over \$861,000,000, and they made less than 2 per cent upon all their sales. They made less than \$1 per head on cattle that passed through their plant.

But of course, Mr. President, the amount of business they did was something marvelous and unheard of in all the history of the world. Notwithstanding the great increase in business their overhead expenses were the same, their advertising was the same, and the percentage on sale expenses were greatly reduced. Their ordinary sales of about \$250,000,000 increased for 1918 to \$861,000,000. Swift & Co. sold over 4,500,000 pounds of beef during 1918. The figures are so startling and so stupendous that we can hardly comprehend them, and we never could have believed them possible unless we had had this world war.

I wish to say now that I can not conceive how it is possible for any man to criticize another for limiting the profits on sales to not more than 2½ per cent. I can not recall, Mr. President, of very many businesses in all the world where organization is so complete that a profit of 2½ per cent on sales will yield an excessive profit on the capital and surplus invested.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator know what per cent the packers made upon their capital and surplus for the year 1918?

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say in this connection—and I am glad the Senator asked the question—that capital and surplus was not the only money used by Armour & Co. during the year 1918. They had over \$250,000,000 of borrowed money—

Mr. BORAH. I am asking the Senator a question now: What was the per cent which they made upon their capital and surplus for 1917 and 1918? I do not care anything about this 2½ per cent turnover. If men can turn it over in a monopolistic field, that does not mean anything at all. How much did they make at the end of their year upon the capital and surplus?

Mr. SMOOT. I have not yet received the statement and I can not say what the profits are, but I do say that the contract which was made between the packers and Mr. Hoover was that they should not make more than 9 per cent.

Mr. BORAH. That was on one line of their industry. On all the rest of it they were left absolutely free and untrammelled, and made as high as 47 per cent upon some of their other industries.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, not only their meat products and food products but all the other products produced by them sold for \$861,000,000 for the year 1918, and they made less than 2 per cent upon the whole of it, by-products and all.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not basing my opposition to this bill upon the profits of the packers, but I do not like to see a false economic principle receive the support of the Senator. I am sure the Senator from Utah will not differ from me with regard to the real principles.

Armour & Co. have \$100,000,000 capital stock. They have that because they increased it fivefold, I think in 1915 or 1916, out of the surplus which had been laid aside in the previous years, which represented, of course, their profits. The true way of determining whether Armour & Co. sold their stock at too high a price is to ascertain the return which the business afforded upon the capital invested in the business. If they made \$15,000,000 in 1918, that represents a return of 15 per cent upon the \$100,000,000 capital. It is true that Armour & Co., and I suppose it is true of other packers, borrowed a large amount of money during the course of that year, but the interest which they paid upon the money which they borrowed is reckoned as a part of the expenses of the business.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is all deducted before we arrive at the profits upon the capital actually invested by those who own the business.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is perfectly correct.

Mr. CUMMINS. Therefore the question is whether 15 per cent on the capital invested is more than a business should return to capital.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is not one of the Senators here who does not know that if it had not been for the wonderful demand created by the war the sales of Armour & Co. would not have been \$861,000,000. In proportion to the amount of their sales less than that their gains would have been less.

I know concerns in this country that have in two years during the war not only cleared every dollar of the cost of putting up their plants, every dollar which was invested in any way for operating the plant, but have made hundreds of per cent in addition. I do not believe that was right. I do not believe, Mr. President, that Mr. Hoover did wrong in controlling the packers. If they had not been controlled, with the demand for foodstuffs all over the world, no one can tell where the prices would have gone. If the sugar producers of this country had not been controlled, I believe that sugar would have advanced in this country to 20 cents a pound, the same as many of the foreign countries have been and are paying to-day. The best thing that was ever done for the American people was the control of the production of sugar in this country and the control of the Cuban sugar. I say now that Mr. Hoover could not have controlled the sugar that is produced in Cuba unless he had the power granted him by our allies to buy the whole of the crop, and that they would not have purchased a pound of it.

Has the producer of sugar in Cuba suffered? No. Last year he was paid \$6.50 per hundred pounds for his sugar, 100 per cent more than he received before the war. They made millions of money, and it was a mighty good thing that the price was controlled, because there was a scramble for sugar all over the world, and no telling where the price would have gone if it had not been controlled.

Mr. President, there has been a good deal said here in this connection with reference to the reconstruction of our industries in this country, now that the war is over. Would to God that it had been undertaken more than a year ago in this country. Mr. President, on the 11th day of April, 1918, over 10 months ago, I delivered an address before the Industrial Club of Chicago, and among other things I referred to this very matter of the reconstruction of our industries after the close of the war. I do not know whether I could better express it now than I did upon that occasion. The part I shall take the time to read is very short. It is as follows:

"Practical wisdom is only to be learned in the school of experience. The hard facts of existence give that touch of truth to character which can never be imparted by reading or tuition, but only from contact with mankind.

"Fine sense and exalted sense are not half as useful as common sense. There are a host of men of wit to one man of sense. That has been the case in all the ages of the world, and no doubt will continue so until the end.

"When war was declared by the United States against the Imperial German Government we found ourselves totally unprepared, and I am fearful that unless some action is soon taken by our Government we will find ourselves unprepared to meet conditions that will arise in the world's commerce when peace is declared.

"Our leading allies and our enemies as well have already established industrial departments to deal with commercial and economical problems which will arise after the close of the war.

"No such action has been taken to enable our industrial institutions to meet the competition following the close of the war, which will be the most severe of any age of the world.

"I read not long ago an account in a foreign paper of arrangements already made by England, France, and Germany to

capture as great a proportion of the commerce of the world as lies in their power.

"I pause here long enough to say that there is a feeling—shall I say of resentment on the part of a few who actually believe that to-day England is thinking more of her future control of commerce than she is of winning the war?

"I know that there is no straw left unturned by England to not only retain her world-wide commerce, but to enlarge it, and we have but to look at the statistics of other countries and we will see her foreign trade has not diminished but increased since the war began.

"We must not forget that when this war closes the industries of all the countries will be highly efficient compared with what they were before the war. There are a thousand problems that will be involved never dreamed of before the war, and we must squarely meet them, or our trade with foreign countries will be lost—what little we had.

"We will find that within a month after the close of the war England and Germany and other countries will have their merchant marines plowing the seas and hastening to carry raw material to their manufacturing plants, at present making munitions of war, but restored to their original purposes.

"Is there any doubt that following this war the question of employing the millions of soldiers released will be one that will demand the greatest wisdom on the part of public and business men, as well as the laboring men themselves?

"In England, for instance, a ministry of reconstruction has been created, and through that agency the minutest details are being perfected for reconstructing their whole economic and social structure.

"Among the subjects the ministry is considering are finance, raw materials, military stores, labor employment, agriculture, education, foreign trade, and public administration.

"Our allies believe that in time of war they should prepare for peace.

"Congress should not adjourn the present session without specific action along these lines. I am not alarmed about internal troubles occurring during the war period, but I am fearful of what is going to happen after the war and before normal conditions are restored.

"I am worried as to what is going to happen when wages must be readjusted in order to meet foreign competition; when we must arrange to maintain our own home markets; when hundreds of thousands of laboring men will be seeking employment; when the American people will fully realize that extraordinary war taxes will continue to be imposed and collected for years after the war is closed."

Mr. President, I do not go further; but I could proceed for hours and tell the people of the United States what a chance we have missed in the last 12 months in not preparing for the reconstruction of our industries with a view to the employment of our laboring men at the close of the war.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. In connection with what the Senator is just saying, it may not be out of place to call attention to the fact that on January 4, 1918, I introduced a resolution in the Senate to provide for a commission to look into the problems of peace. That commission was to have on it representatives of all the leading industries of the country, and it was to do just exactly what the Senator has pointed out the importance of doing. I introduced that resolution, but we could get no action from any of the committees controlled by the majority.

Mr. SMOOT. I remember well the resolution offered by the Senator. Not only that, but I remember well the resolution that was offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS]. But no notice was taken of them. We have been drifting along. Mr. President, with no preparation whatever, and the war coming to an end so suddenly, throwing millions of men back into industrial pursuits, has already brought to the attention of the American people the lack of former action that was so necessary along this line.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. The case is most admirably stated in the extract which the Senator from Utah has read from his speech in Chicago. It is a graphic description of the situation and of our duty. What I should like to know, however, is this: It will require a very large expenditure of the public money—temporarily, at least—to bring about the preparation for peace in our own country. How does the Senator from Utah expect to aid the accomplishment of that purpose by spending a hundred million dollars for reconstruction in Europe?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is no proposition here for spending \$100,000,000 for reconstruction in Europe. There is a proposition for spending \$100,000,000 of American money, together with \$200,000,000 of the money of the countries associated with us in this war, for the purpose of preserving life.

I want to say now to the Senator from Iowa that I would not vote to appropriate one single solitary cent of American money if I thought it was going into the development of the commerce of foreign countries. I do not believe a dollar of it will be spent for that purpose. If it is so spent, I will say to the Senator that it will be spent without any authority of law, without the approval of the American people, and it ought to be condemned, and will be condemned by all.

I have voted for many measures in the last two years which in ordinary times I should not have voted for under any circumstance; legislation has been passed here within the last two years which I believe was revolutionary and socialistic in the most rampant form; and I hope and pray that its enactment will not have the effect of encouraging the people in ordinary peace times to demand such legislation for the future.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. It occurred to me while the Senator from Utah was reading from his very admirable address delivered in Chicago that we ought not to lose sight of the fact that up to about November 11 we were pretty busily engaged preparing for war and turning out war materials. I do not see that we had much leeway to do very much toward preparing for peace up to that time. I think the Senator will admit that the war ended pretty nearly a year before most of us expected it would end. At any rate, there was not very much we could do except to counsel looking ahead, and that sort of thing, beyond what we were doing to turn out munitions and other means of winning the war.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, how mistaken the Senator is! When England and France were in a death struggle, drawing every man possible from their industries, three years ago they found men at home with sufficient knowledge and wisdom to consider reconstruction of industries after the war most thoroughly. Did England stop and did France stop the formation of a plan for reconstruction in the darkest days of last April, when it looked to all the world as though the very next day Germany would break through their lines and take Paris? I believe, Mr. President, as much as I believe anything, that if it had not been for an overruling power the Germans would have captured Paris. Last April when Germany was pressing the French Army back each day, and the supreme effort finally made a break in the line, I am told that a dense fog, so thick that a man could hardly see his hand before him, settled over the two great contending armies, and it was for that reason that the Germans did not know that the French line was broken for the width of 8 miles and the road to Paris was open to the German Army. However, it was not to be so; God ruled it otherwise.

I say now that the lack of providing for a reconstruction program is one of the things which will result to the disadvantage of our country more than anything that has happened in this war.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator from Utah calls attention to the fact that France and England more than three years ago anticipated the necessity for preparing for peace conditions. Is he aware of the fact that President Wilson two years ago anticipated this situation and prepared to meet it? Let me call his attention to President Wilson's declaration with regard to this matter. I find in the published volume of his addresses and papers, on page 315, that President Wilson said:

Besides contributing our ungrudging moral and practical support to the establishment of peace throughout the world, we must actively and intelligently prepare ourselves to do our full service in the trade and industry which are to sustain and develop the life of the nations in the days to come.

I hope the Senator from Utah will mark the succeeding language:

We have already been provident in this great matter and supplied ourselves with the instrumentalities of prompt adjustment. We have created in the Federal Trade Commission a means of inquiry and of accommodation in the field of commerce which ought both to coordinate the enterprises of our traders and manufacturers and to remove the barriers of misunderstanding and of a too technical interpretation of the law.

Again:

In the new Tariff Commission we have added another instrumentality of observation and adjustment which promises to be immediately serv-

iceable. The Trade Commission substitutes counsel and accommodation for the harsher processes of legal restraint, and the Tariff Commission ought to substitute facts for prejudices and theories. Our exporters have for some time had the advantage of working in the new light thrown upon foreign markets and opportunities of trade by the intelligent inquiries and activities of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, which the Democratic Congress so wisely created in 1912. The Tariff Commission completes the machinery by which we shall be enabled to open up our legislative policy to the facts as they develop.

I call this to the Senator's attention in order that he may not be unnecessarily concerned about our future.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, all I have to say as to that is, may Providence have mercy upon the industries of this country if they are compelled to rely upon what the commissions named in that address will do for them.

Mr. McLEAN. I understand that there are only three active members now on the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. SMOOT. That is all.

Mr. McLEAN. But they have some thousand employees, who, I understand, are receiving a living wage out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not desire to take the time of the Senate any further. I simply felt like saying what I have said upon this occasion more in explanation of my position than for any real benefit or assistance it might afford in the passage of the bill.

Mr. KELLOGG obtained the floor.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KELLOGG. I wish the Senator from Virginia would not do that. If Senators do not wish to hear me, I do not desire their attendance.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think Senators ought to be present, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harding	Myers	Smoot
Bankhead	Henderson	New	Spencer
Borah	Hitchcock	Nugent	Swanson
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Thomas
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Thompson
Colt	Kellogg	Poindestre	Townsend
Culberson	Kirby	Pollock	Trammell
Cummins	Knox	Pomerene	Underwood
Curtis	La Follette	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Lewis	Saulsbury	Warren
France	McLean	Shafroth	Weeks
Gay	McNary	Sheppard	Williams
Gerry	Martin, Ky.	Sherman	Wolcott
Gore	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	
Hale	Moses	Smith, Mich.	

Mr. FRANCE. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] on official business of the Senate.

Mr. WEEKS. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. LODGE] is unavoidably absent from the Senate to-day. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, in discussing this measure I promise brevity. I should not address myself to the subject at all but for the surpassing importance of the bill and because I believe it involves the honor of this Nation.

The discussion has assumed a wide range. Much of it has been interesting, but I believe has no direct bearing upon the great question at issue. We have heard discussed the shipping program, price fixing, the Food Administration, and general economic questions bearing upon the prosperity of this country. In my opinion this bill should be considered within much narrower limits.

I do not need to confess that, with other Senators, I have great reluctance in bringing my mind to support this bill. I had hoped, as the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has said, that the war was practically ended and that we could stop making these appalling appropriations which are being imposed upon the taxpayers of this country, and I shall join the Senators in doing everything I can to relieve that condition; but, Mr. President, I am not prepared to say that, when the cry of distress comes from a stricken world, we should turn a deaf ear to it.

What are the conditions? For four years a war has ravaged Europe, involving more countries and having greater effect upon the civilization of the world than any conflict since the fall of Rome or the French Revolution—appalling in its losses, in its

waste, in its crimes, and in the trail of want, misery, and starvation which has followed it.

Now, what do we find to be the conditions in Europe? Take Serbia, for instance. As the armies of the central empires swept through the peaceful agricultural valleys of that land they devastated homes, drove off the cattle, destroyed the farm machinery, the food, the very seed, and left the country a desert. The Serbian people were driven into a little corner at Monastir, where was evidenced the greatest heroism of any little nation oppressed and beset by all the mighty power of the central empires.

Look at Poland. We have thousands and hundreds of thousands of industrious Polish citizens in this country. They are good citizens. We have thousands of them in my State. For generations and generations, aye, even for centuries, the hope of an independent Poland has inspired that people; but over her land swept back and forth the contending armies of Russia and Germany until it became a waste. I shall not go into the details of the condition of these friendly people who have sacrificed everything they had for the same cause you and I were supporting. We have recognized them; we have stated that we desire them to establish a government; we have recognized the Slavs of central Europe, and to-day they are starving.

I realize that my first duty is to the American soldiers who went upon the blood-stained fields of France to defend this Nation and to fight for our cause; I have not been remiss in my duty to them, and I shall not be. I realize that my first duty is to the toiling masses of my own country, and everything I can do to insure to them cheaper food, better living conditions, and good wages I shall do.

We have for several years been aiding in feeding stricken Belgium. I need not repeat the story of that people; but if it had not been for little Belgium, which stood at the gates and prevented the onslaught of the Hun, as Charles Martel met the invading hosts centuries ago, I do not know what the history of civilization would have been.

I am confident that the feeling in this country is such that if there were opportunity, if there were time to collect \$100,000,000 by private subscription in order to meet the demands of Europe at this time, the American people would gladly give that sum; but, as has been said, relief must come to these people now, if it comes at all, and we are wasting precious moments even while we are debating the question, although I think it should be discussed fully on all sides. I am very glad to hear the opinions of Senators who do not agree with me, for I wish all the light I can procure upon the subject. But, Mr. President, do what we can, let all the civilized nations of the world do what they can, yet thousands upon thousands of people will starve before we can furnish relief. It is impossible to bring to the stricken people of Russia the relief that will prevent starvation.

Now, what is the condition? At the close of this great war the commissions of all of the allied nations have assembled in Paris to meet those of the opposing nations. We also have in Paris the allied committee, which during the last few months of the war was such an important factor in uniting the forces of the four great powers in order to meet the onslaughts of the German Empire. We acted in this fight as one great force, one great nation, each being inspired by the same desire and the same hope to bring about the same object. What have they done? Senators, let me read to you again the resolutions adopted in Paris, and then if any Senator wishes to say that we shall not vote this credit it will rest upon his conscience:

The following resolutions, adopted Sunday, January 12, at meeting of supreme council of supply and relief, were presented yesterday at the meeting of the presiding war council and were formally adopted by the representatives of the allied Governments and the United States:

"1. That it is imperative in the interest of humanity and for the maintenance of orderly government that relief should be given to certain European countries. It is provisionally estimated that for the furnishing of this relief till next harvest a minimum sum of \$300,000,000 may be necessary, apart from the requirements of Germany, which will be separately examined.

"2. The council is of opinion that this sum of \$300,000,000 should be placed at its disposal by the four associated Governments.

"3. That the financial representatives of the four Governments should consider and make recommendations to meet this expenditure.

"4. If these recommendations be accepted by the council, they should then be referred to the respective Governments for their approval."

Mr. President, that comes from the same allied council which marshaled the hosts of England, France, Italy, and the United States to meet the great final onslaught of the desperate Hun.

Mr. President, have we turned a deaf ear to the demands of that allied council before? Did we hesitate in voting millions and billions to carry on this war? Necessarily much of it was wasted. In the haste with which we made preparation, being an unprepared Nation, we, of course, wasted hundreds of millions of dollars. But whenever that allied council called on us for men, for money, for sacrifice, we met their demands, and

because we did there has ended the greatest war that ever cast its shadow over civilization.

Now, Mr. President, who are the men who are to administer this allied fund? Let me read their names. They are not unknown to you or to the American people:

Lord Reading, the ambassador of Great Britain to the United States, and Sir John Beale, chairman wheat executive, London, will represent the English Government. For the French Government the representatives are Vilgrain, undersecretary of state for supply, and Clementel, minister of commerce. Italy at present is represented by Signor Attolico until her regular representatives arrive, and the United States is represented by Mr. Hoover and by Mr. Norman Davis.

I shall not discuss the question whether it would have been better not to have passed the food law or some other laws which have been enacted. I shall not discuss the record and career of Mr. Hoover. I will say that I believe him to be a high-minded, honorable, patriotic, and exceedingly able man. When Belgium had been destroyed before we entered the war and when France and England desired some one to take charge of the great charitable undertaking in feeding their people and keeping them from starvation they selected Mr. Hoover.

I do not think Mr. Hoover believes, in time of peace, in regulating prices or fixing prices or anything of the kind. At the meeting referred to by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] Mr. Hoover recommended to the Senators present that whatever pressure might be brought to bear or whatever arguments were made the food law should expire with this war and that economically, in a country like ours, prices should not be fixed except under circumstances such as those to which we have been subjected.

Europe selected Mr. Hoover, who has had vast experience, to be the head of this commission. Not only that, Mr. President, but the representatives of this country in Paris, selected to make peace, have recommended this as a necessity; and, again, the President of this country, who is representing us at that conference, has recommended it in the most earnest manner. So we have the united judgment of the allied council, these gentlemen of the highest standing who are to act as the commissioners to handle the funds, our representatives at the peace conference, and the President of the United States.

I have followed the President in some things which were against my judgment; but I wished to place in his hands all the power which a united Nation could place there, that he might win this war, hoping that it would be the last great destructive war for generations and centuries to come.

Mr. President, I know this: The countries which are organized, the countries which have the semblance of an organized government, stand ready to issue their bonds or other securities to pay for food and aid their people. I was talking with the Minister from Serbia. Little Serbia, with all she has suffered, is ready to-day in Washington to give the bonds of the Serbian Government for every dollar of food and assistance which this allied council may furnish her. Of course, we are not going to give food to France. Belgium is ready to give her bonds, and they will be good, for it is a rich country, inhabited by an industrious people, ready to give their bonds for her aid. I have no doubt that any of the nations of Europe which are organized, which have a semblance of government, will give their securities for any assistance which may be rendered them; but, nevertheless, I have no doubt that with all this assistance there are struggling peoples in Europe over whom hang the horrors of famine, and I am not ready to say that I am going to turn a deaf ear to the piteous sobs of those broken nations.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. KELLOGG. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. From the Senator's investigations, does he believe that the allied governments and the United States have entered into any form of contract to carry out this plan?

Mr. KELLOGG. I have no doubt whatever that, as arranged and as indicated by this resolution, the council of the allied governments have agreed on a plan to furnish relief to these countries. Now, I should be glad if the committee could have had before it Mr. Hoover and representatives from these countries, who could have given us detailed information as to just what countries food may be sent or seed need be sent or clothing need be sent, and how much, and what countries will be able to pay for them or give their securities for supplies; and I believe it would have been better if more detailed information had been sent to Congress. But I do realize, Mr. President, that the war has not been at an end but a couple of months. I do realize that Europe was in chaos, and likely

they do not know the complete details, which must be worked out from time to time. But, as the Senator from Michigan has just said, I have no doubt that there is an agreement between the allied nations to carry on as one body this relief to the stricken world.

Mr. President, it has been suggested that if we have a surplus of food we should appropriate that food to give to these countries and not appropriate money as a revolving fund. I should be perfectly willing, if the allied council should say at this moment, "We wish so many bushels of wheat, so many pounds of meat, and so much clothing from the United States," and we had it, to appropriate that; but I think it has occurred to every Senator that it is impossible for them to make such estimates.

Certainly the great proportion of this relief must come from this country. Do not forget, Senators, that last year the foreign commerce of this country reached the unparalleled amount of \$9,000,000,000—more by three billions than any country ever before realized in any one year in all the history of the world—and that the balance of trade in favor of this country was \$3,000,000,000. In other words, Europe paid us three billions more than we paid them.

Why, Mr. President, if labor is to have its just wages, as it ought, if industries are to be maintained, if the farmers of this country are to find a market for their products, that market must be found in Europe, because we are a surplus-producing people. Now, there is no question but that the Government of the United States has purchased most of the wheat surplus and paid for it, and is obligated to pay for any of the balance which is offered. I shall not go into the details of that; but we have a surplus of 319,000,000 bushels this year, and Mr. Hoover has sold to the allied countries 200,000,000 bushels at the price this Government paid for it, plus the carrying charges and expenses, and we undoubtedly will find a market for the balance; for I believe the European countries must buy their surplus wheat from us, because we are in a better position to furnish it and send it to them.

I am not in favor of keeping up the prices of products—not at all. I realize that the war is practically over. I realize that the guaranteed price of wheat was established at a time when no man could foretell the result of this war. It was made after one of the shortest wheat crops in this country and in the world. It was made when the President and the Congress felt as though there must be a greater production of wheat in order to win the war, and it was made, it must not be forgotten, when the price of wheat was \$2.50 and \$3 a bushel and rising every day, and it was made to insure food to the armies and the peoples of the world fighting in a common cause.

I am not in favor of maintaining that price to the American workingman and to the American people. I would prefer that the Government buy the wheat and sell it in the market, so that our own people may have the benefit of the world's price and food at normal prices; but, come what may, the Congress must keep its pledge to the farmers of this country.

Mr. President, I think I have said all that I desire to say on this bill, with one exception. I am not going to vote for it solely because it is a charity, or solely because it will stabilize the governments of Europe, or solely because it will stop the advance of bolshevism, although I do realize that in those countries where nations are seeking to realize their ambitions toward autonomy you can not set up and maintain a government over starving people; but I am going to vote for it because it is one of the factors in the closing of a great world conflict which has spread starvation, misery, disease, and want over all of Europe, and I wish to do my share and to have my country do its share in aiding to bring about an honorable peace, in maintaining good governments in Europe, and in feeding those stricken people.

I deny that by voting for this bill I commit myself to maintaining for all time the autonomy of the governments of Europe which may be established, large and small. I am not in favor of crossing the ocean to pledge the honor and strength of this Nation to maintain all the governments which may be set up in Europe; but I am in favor, at the close of this war, as to the peoples who have been fighting with us for the same object and inspired by the same hopes, of aiding them in their hour of dire peril and extremity.

And so, Mr. President, when the war clouds have rolled away and the passions of nations have cooled and we can see more clearly the future of these countries, it is my hope that the stricken peoples of Europe will form governments modeled after our own, where the right of the people to govern shall be perpetuated, and that autocratic rule shall have ended in the world.

RECESS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, January 24, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, January 23, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, profoundly sensible of our utter dependence upon Thee, we approach Thee in the sacred attitude of prayer and devotion, that we may express our gratitude for all that Thou hast done for us, as individuals and as a Nation, in the past; fervently praying that Thou wilt continue to inspire, uphold, and guide us, that we may know more of Thy will and better how to fulfill the same. In the spirit of the Lord Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 390) to establish the Grand Canyon National Park in the State of Arizona.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HAWLEY, for to-day, on account of sickness.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

On motion of Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 14746) making appropriations for current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, with Mr. CAISE in the chair.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL].

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, few people in this country know the manner or the way in which men are tried by court-martial in our Army; and although 16,000 cases have been disposed of during the past year, little or no attention has been given to the procedure and to the fact that justice has not been meted out to them.

The usual procedure is for the commanding officer of a division to direct a court-martial to assemble, with the members of that court-martial selected by him in person, convened when and where he directs the court to assemble, and although the penalty may be death, the accused soldier is permitted to plead guilty with an officer—usually a second lieutenant—assigned to him to defend him.

Few of our citizens know that on the other side four privates who were found sleeping on post were tried before courts of the kind stated by me, a second lieutenant assigned to defend these men, and in two cases a plea of guilty entered by the second lieutenant, and the convening authority requested that these men be executed, although they were only 20 years of age. The records in the cases show that the judge advocate general of the American Expeditionary Forces asked for full execution in order that other men might be deterred from sleeping on post. Luckily for these men and the good name of the Nation the attention of the President was brought to the cases, the sentences were commuted, and the men ordered back to military duty. In one case a young lad who had distinguished himself at Soissons on July 18, 19, and 20, and who received the distinguished-service cross for bravery, was found sleeping on post after having come out from a hospital. The sentence of the court was four years. The convening authority reviewed it, and then and there it ended so far as any further review of the proceedings were concerned in his case. There have been 16,000 such cases tried—

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield in this connection?

Mr. SIEGEL. Certainly.

Mr. LAZARO. Has the gentleman any information as to the number of soldiers who were condemned to death by these courts-martial?

Mr. SIEGEL. No; I have not, because it has been impossible to obtain the proper data. We know that there have been 16,000 such cases tried. We know that the chief officer in each division